

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

034

M 804

4.3

SANSKRIT TEXTS

ON THE

ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA.

ORIGINAL SANSKRIT TEXTS

ON THE

ORIGIN AND HISTORY

OF

THE PEOPLE OF INDIA,

THEIR RELIGION AND INSTITUTIONS.

COLLECTED, TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH,
AND ILLUSTRATED BY REMARKS,

CHIEFLY

FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS AND OTHERS IN INDIA.

BY

J. MUIR, D.C.L.,

LATE OF THE BENGAL CIVIL SERVICE.

PART THIRD.

THE VEDAS: OPINIONS OF THEIR AUTHORS, AND OF LATER INDIAN
WRITERS, IN REGARD TO THEIR ORIGIN, INSPIRATION,
AND AUTHORITY.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,

14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON.
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

M.DCCC.LXI.



HERTFORD:
Printed by STEPHEN AUSTIN, Fore Street.

P R E F A C E.

THE principal object which I have had in view in this volume, as in the two which preceded it, has been to assist the researches of those Hindus who may desire to investigate critically the most important points in the civil and religious history of their nation. Having shown in the First Part that the mythical and legendary accounts, given in the Puranas, etc., regarding the origin of the caste system which has long prevailed in India, are mutually contradictory and totally insufficient to establish the truth of the popular belief regarding the distinct creation of four separate tribes; and having endeavoured to prove, in the Second Part, by a variety of arguments, drawn chiefly from comparative philology and from the contents of the Rig-veda, that the Hindus are descended from a branch of the Indo-Germanic stock, which dwelt originally along with the other cognate races, in Central Asia, and subsequently migrated into Northern Hindustan, where the Brahmanical religion and institutions were developed and matured;—I now come, in this Third Part, to consider more particularly the history of the Vedas, regarded as the sacred Scriptures of the Hindus, and the inspired source *from* which their religious and philosophical systems (though, to a great extent, founded also on

reasoning and speculation) profess to be mainly derived; or *with* which, at least, they all pretend to be in harmony.

When I speak, however, of the *history* of the Veda, I am reminded that I am employing a term which will suggest to the philosophical reader the idea of a minute and systematic account of all the various opinions which the Indians have held in regard to their sacred books from the commencement, through all the successive stages of their theological development, down to the present time. To do anything like this, however, would be a task demanding an extent of research far exceeding that to which I can pretend. At some future time, indeed, we may hope that a history of the theological and speculative ideas of the Indians, which shall treat this branch also of the subject, may be written by some competent scholar. My own design is much more modest. I only attempt to show what are the opinions on the subject of the Veda, which have been entertained by certain distinct sets of writers whom I may broadly divide into three classes—(1) the mythological, (2) the scholastic, and (3) the Vedic.

The first, or mythological class, embraces the writers of the different Puranas and Itihāsas, and partially those of the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads, who, like the compilers of the Puranas, frequently combine the mythological with the theosophic element.

The second, or scholastic class, includes the authors of the different philosophical schools, or Darśanas, with their scholiasts and expositors, and the commentators on the Vedas. The whole of these writers belong

to the class of systematic or philosophical theologians ; but as their speculative principles differ, it is the object of each particular school to explain and establish the origin and authority of the Vedas on grounds conformable to its own fundamental dogmas, as well as to expound the doctrines of the sacred books in such a way as to harmonise with its own special tenets.

The third class of writers, whose opinions in regard to the Vedas I have attempted to exhibit, is composed (1) of the rishis themselves, the authors of the Vedic hymns, and (2) of the authors of the Upanishads, which, though works of a much more recent date, and for the most part of a different character from the hymns, are yet regarded by later Indian writers as forming, equally with the latter, a part of the Veda. As the authors of the hymns, the earliest of them at least, lived in an age of simple conceptions, and of spontaneous and childlike devotion, we shall find that, though some of them appear, in conformity with the spirit of their times, to have regarded their compositions as in a certain degree the result of divine inspiration, their primeval and elementary ideas on this subject form a strong contrast to the artificial and systematic definitions of the later scholastic writers. And even the authors of the Upanishads, though they, in a more distinct manner, claim a super-human authority for their own productions, are very far from recognizing the rigid classification which, at a subsequent period, divided the Vedic writings from all other religious works, by a broad line of demarcation.

It may conduce to the convenience of the reader, if I furnish here a brief survey of the opinions of the three

classes of writers above described, in regard to the Vedas, as these opinions are shown in the passages which are collected in the present volume. And this becomes the more expedient, as, since the body of this work was composed, I have discovered some additional texts of considerable importance, representing the tenets of the Mūnānsaka and Naiyāyika schools, either in fuller detail or under somewhat different aspects, which I have had to throw into an appendix, and to which it is therefore the more necessary that I should here draw the reader's attention in connection with the other texts of the same schools, which are cited in the earlier part of the collection.

The first chapter (p. 1-113) contains texts exhibiting the opinions on the origin, division, inspiration, and authority of the Vedas, which have been held by Indian authors subsequent to the collection of the Vedic Hymns, and consequently embraces the views of the first two of the classes of writers above specified, viz., (1) the mythological and (2) the scholastic. In the first Section (pp. 3-6), I adduce texts from the Satapatha Brahmana, the Chhandogya Upanishad, and the Institutes of Manu, in which the first three Vedas are described as having been produced from fire, air, and the sun. In the second Section (pp. 6-12) are quoted two passages from the Vishnu and Bhāgavata Puranas, which represent the four Vedas to have issued from the mouth of Brahmā at the creation; a third from the Vrihad Aranyaka Upanishad, which describes the Vedas, as well as other śāstras, as being the breath of Brahma; several from the Harivana, which speak of the Vedas as pro-

duced from the Gāyatrī, or as created by Brahmā; another from the Mahābhārata, which describes Sarasvatī as the mother of the Vedas; with two from the Rik and Atharva Vedas, one of which derives the Vedas from the mystical victim Purusha, and the other makes them spring from Time. In page 227 of the Appendix a second passage of the Atharva-veda is cited, in which the Vedas are declared to have sprung from the leavings of the sacrifice (*ucchelhishtha*). Another text is quoted from Manu, which describes the Vedas, along with certain other objects, as being the *second* manifestation of the *Sattva-guna*, or pure principle, while Brahma is one of its *first* manifestations. Two further quotations from the Vishnu Purana assert the eternity of the Veda and its oneness with Vishnu. The third Section (pp. 12-19) contains various passages from Manu, in which the great dignity, power, authority, and efficacy of the Veda are celebrated; together with two other texts from the same author and the Vishnu Purana, in which a certain impurity is predicated of the Sāma-veda; and two more from the Vāyu and Brahma-vaiwartta Puranas, which derogate in some degree from the consideration of the Vedas, by setting up a counter claim to respect in favour of the Puranas. A further passage is quoted from the Mundaka Upanishad, in which the Vedas and their appendages are designated as the “inferior science,” in contrast to the “superior science,” the knowledge of Soul. The fourth Section (pp. 20-31) describes the division of the Vedas in the third or Dvāpara age, by Vedavyāsa and his four pupils, according to texts of the Vishnu, Vāyu, and Bhāgavata Puranas; and then ad-

duces a different account, asserting their division in the second or Tretā age, by the King Purūravas, according to another passage of the same Bhāgavata Purana, and a text of the Mahābhārata (though the latter is silent regarding Purūravas). Section fifth (pp. 31-39) contains passages from the Vishnu and Vāyu Puranas and the Śatapatha Brahmana, regarding the schism between the adherents of the Yajur-veda, as represented by the different schools of Vaiśampāyana and Yājnavalkya, and quotes certain remarks of Prof. Weber on the same subject, with some other texts, as adduced and illustrated by that scholar, on the hostility of the Atharvanas towards the other Vedas, and of the Chhandogas towards the Rig-veda.

Section vi. (pp. 39-52) contains extracts from the works of Sāyana and Mādhaba, the commentators on the Rik and Taittirīya Yajur Vedas, in which they both define the characteristics of the Veda, and state certain arguments in support of its authority. Sāyana (pp. 40-47), after noticing the objections urged against his views by persons of a different school, and defining the Veda as a work consisting of Mantra and Brahmana, asserts that it is not derived from any personal, or at least not from any human, author (compare note 39, p. 51); and rests its authority on its own declarations, on its self-proving power, on the smṛiti (*i.e.*, non-vedic writings of eminent saints), and on common notoriety. He then encounters some other objections raised against the Veda on the score of its containing passages which are unintelligible, dubious, absurd, contradictory, or superfluous. Mādhaba (pp. 47-52) defines the Veda as the work which alone

reveals the supernatural means of attaining future felicity; explains that males only, belonging to the three superior castes, are competent to study its contents; and asserts that, inasmuch as it is eternal, it is a primary and infallible authority. This eternity of the Veda, however, he appears to interpret as not being absolute, but as dating from the first creation, when it was produced from Brahma, though, as he is free from defects, the Veda, as his work, is self-proved.

Section vii. (pp. 52-73) contains the views of Jaimini and Bādarayana the (alleged) authors of the Mīmānsā and Brahma (or Vedānta) Sūtras on the eternity of the Veda. Jaimini asserts that sound, or words, are eternal, that the connection between words and the objects they represent also, is not arbitrary or conventional, but eternal, and that consequently the Vedas convey unerring information in regard to unseen objects. This view he defends against the objections of the Naiyāyikas, insisting that the names, derived from those of certain sages, by which particular parts of the Vedas are designated, do not prove those sages to have been their authors, but merely their students; while none of the names occurring in the Veda are those of temporal beings, but all denote some objects which have existed eternally. Some of these notions are further enforced in a passage from the summary of the Mīmānsā doctrine, given in the Sarva-darśana-sangraha, which I have quoted in the Appendix (pp. 190-206). The writer first notices the Naiyāyika objections to the Mīmānsaka tenet that the Veda had no personal author, viz., (1) that any tradition to this effect must have been interrupted at the

past dissolution of the universe; (2) that it would be impossible to prove that *no one* had ever recollected any such author; (3) that the sentences of the Veda have the same character as all other sentences; (4) that the inference,—drawn from the present mode of transmitting the Vedas from teacher to pupil,—that the same mode of transmission must have gone on from eternity, breaks down by being equally applicable to any other book; (5) that the Veda is in fact ascribed to a personal author in a passage of the book itself; (6) that sound is not eternal, and that when we recognize letters as the *same* we have heard before, this does not prove their identity or eternity, but is merely a recognition of them as belonging to the same *species* as other letters we have heard before; (7) that though Parameśvara (God) is naturally incorporeal, he may have assumed a body in order to reveal the Veda, etc. The writer then states the Mīmānsaka answers to these arguments thus: What does this alleged ‘production by a personal author’ (*paurushyatva*) mean? The Veda, if supposed to be so produced, cannot derive its authority (*a*) from inference (or reasoning), as fallible books employ the same process. Nor will it suffice to say (*b*) that it derives its authority from its truth: for the Veda is defined to be a book *which proves that which can be proved in no other way*. And even if Parameśvara (God) were to assume a body, he would not, *in that state of limitation*, have any access to supernatural knowledge. Further, the fact that different *sākhās* or recensions of the Vedas are called after the names of particular sages, proves no more than that these recensions were *studied* by those sages, and affords

no ground for questioning the eternity of the Vedas,—an eternity which is proved by the fact of our recognizing letters when we meet with them. These letters are the very identical letters we had heard before, for there is no evidence to show either that letters of the same sort (G's, for instance) are numerically different from each other, or that they are *generic terms, denoting a species*. The apparent differences which are observable in the same letter, result merely from the particular characteristics of the persons who utter it, and do not affect its identity. This is followed by further reasoning in support of the same general view; and the writer then arrives at the conclusion, which he seems to himself to have triumphantly established, that the Veda is underived and authoritative. After noticing the different grounds on which authoritativeness, and non-authoritativeness, respectively, are rested by the principal Indian schools, the Naiyāyika is next introduced as raising another difficulty, as to the self-dependent (or self-derived) authority which is claimed for the Veda. What, he asks, is the source of this self-dependent authority? He gives four conceivable definitions of what it may be supposed to mean, and shows to his own satisfaction that they are all untenable. The Mīmānsaka then interposes, and brings forward a fifth definition. His conclusion appears to be that authoritativeness springs from the constituents or totality of knowledge.

The question of the effect produced on the Vedas by the dissolutions of the world, which is raised among the other Naiyāyika objections above quoted, without receiving any solution in the Mīmānsaka reply, is noticed

in some extracts from Patanjali's *Mahābhāshya* and its commentators, which have been adduced by Prof. Goldstücker in the Preface to his *Mānava-kalpa Sūtra*, and have been partly reprinted in my Appendix (pp. 228 ff.). It is admitted by Patanjali, that, though the sense of the Veda is permanent, the order of their letters has not always remained the same, and that this difference is exhibited in the different recensions of the Kāthakas and other schools. Patanjali himself does not say what is the cause of this alteration in the order of the letters; but his commentator, Kaiyyata, states that the order was disturbed during the great dissolutions, etc., and had to be restored (though with variations) by the eminent science of the rishis. Kullūka and Sankara, on the other hand (see pp. 5, 72, and 213, note 10), maintain that the Veda was preserved (*unaltered*, I presume) in the memory of Brahmā during the periods of dissolution.

In the extract given in pp. 65-73 from his commentary on the *Brahma Sūtras*,¹ Sankara, while he follows the author of those *Sūtras*, and Jaimini, in basing the authority of the Vedas on the eternity of sound, finds it necessary to meet an objection that, as the gods mentioned in the Veda had confessedly an origin in time, the words which designate those gods cannot be eternal, but must have originated coevally with the created objects which they denote, since eternal words could not have an eternal connection with non-eternal objects. This difficulty he tries to overcome (by tacitly *abandoning the ground taken by Jaimini*, that the *Veda contains*

¹ My attention was drawn to this passage by an unpublished treatise by the Rev. Prof. Banerjea, of Bishop's College, Calcutta.

*no references to non-eternal objects, and) by asserting that the eternal connection of words is not with *individual* objects, but with the *species* to which these objects belong, and that Indra and the other gods are proved by the Veda to belong to species.* Śankara then goes on to assert, on the authority of Brahma Sūtra, i. 3, 28, fortified by various texts from the Vedas and the smṛitis, that the gods and the world generally are produced (though not in the sense of evolution out of a material cause) from the word of the Vedas (see p. 4, and note, pp. 4 and 5) in the form of *sphoṭa*. This last term will be explained below. It should also be noticed here that in another place (i. 1, 3) the Brahma Sūtras (see note 39, in pp. 51, 52) declare that Brahma was the source of the Veda, and that, on this foundation, Śankara argues that Brahma must be omniscient. If, however, the Vedas are eternal and apparently self-existent, it is not easy to see how they can be at the same time the work of Brahma, and a proof of his omniscience.²

In opposition to the tenets of the Mīmānsakas, who hold the eternity (or the eternal self-existence) of the Veda, and to the kindred dogmas of the Vedānta, as just expounded, Gotama, the author of the Nyāya aphorisms, denies (Section viii. pp. 73-81) the eternity of sound; and after vindicating the Veda from the charges of falsehood, self-contradiction, and tautology, deduces its authority from the authority of the wise, or competent,

² It is true that Śankara gives an alternative interpretation of this Sūtra, viz., that it may be understood as meaning that the Vedas, etc., are "the source, or cause, or proof of Him, i.e., by enabling us rightly to understand his nature." (*Yonih kāranyam pramāṇam asya Brahmano yathāvat svarūpādhigame*). But the explanation given in the text is the first given, and it is not repudiated by Śankara. See Ballantyne's Aphorisms of the Vedānta, pp. 7-10

person who was its author. It does not clearly appear from Gotama's aphorism who the wise person was whom he regards as the maker of the Veda. If he did not believe in a God, (see Appendix, note v. p. 216), he must have regarded the rishis as its authors. The later Naiyāyika writers, however, as the author of the Tarka Sangraha (Appendix, p. 209) and of the Kusumānjali (Appendix, pp. 211-216) clearly refer the Veda to Īśvara (God) as its framer. Udayana, the author of the Kusumānjali, controverts the opinion that the existence of the Veda from eternity can be proved by a continuous tradition, as such a tradition must, he says, have been interrupted at the dissolution of the world, which preceded the existing creation (see above, pp. xi. xiii.) He, therefore (as explained by his commentator), infers an eternal and omniscient author of the Veda; asserting that the Veda is *paurusheya*, or derived from a personal author; that many of its own texts imply this; and that the appellations given to its particular *śākhās* or recensions, are derived from the names of those sages whose persons were assumed by Īśvara, when he uttered them at the creation.

Kapila, the author of the Sāṅkhya Aphorisms (pp. 81-86), agrees with the Nyāya aphorist in denying the eternity of the Veda, but, in conformity with his own principles, differs from Gotama in denying its derivation from a personal (*i.e.*, here, a *divine*) author, because there was no person (*i.e.*, as his commentator explains, no God) to make it. Vishnu, the chief of liberated beings, though omniscient, could not, he argues, have made the Veda, owing to his impassive-

ness, and no other person could have done so from want of omniscience. And even if the Veda have been uttered by the primeval Purusha, it cannot be called his work, as it was breathed forth by him unconsciously. (Compare the passage from the Vedāntist Śankara, pp. 104 and 105.) Kapila agrees with Jaimini in ascribing a self-demonstrating power to the Veda, and differs from the Naiyāyikas in not deriving its authority from correct knowledge possessed by an utterer. He proceeds to controvert the existence of such a thing as *sphoṭa* (a modification of sound which is assumed by the Mīmānsakas, and described as single, indivisible, distinct from individual letters, existing in the form of words, and constituting a whole), and to deny the eternity of sound.

In the ninth Section (pp. 86-107) some short reasonings in support of the supernatural origin of the Veda are quoted from the Nyāya-mālā-vistara (a condensed account of the Mīmānsa system) and from the Vedārtha-prakāśa (the commentary on the Taittirīya Yajur-veda). The arguments in both passages (pp. 86-89) are to the same effect, and contain nothing that has not been already in substance anticipated in the preceding summaries of the Mīmānsa doctrine. In reference to their argument that no author of the Veda is remembered, I have noticed here that the supposition which an objector might urge, that the rishis, the acknowledged *utterers* of the hymns, might also have been their *authors*, is guarded against by the tenet, elsewhere maintained by Indian writers, that the rishis were merely *seers of the pre-existing sacred texts*. Some further passages are next

adduced (pp. 90-96) from the *Nyāya-mālā-vistara*, from Kullūka's commentary on Manu, and from Śankara Achāryya, to show that a distinct line of demarcation is drawn by the scholastic writers between the Veda, on the one hand, and all other classes of Indian scriptures, such as the *smṛiti* (including the Institutes of Manu, the Puranas, and *Itihāsas*, etc.), on the other, the *first* being regarded as an independent and infallible director, while the *others* are (in theory) held to be only authoritative guides, in so far as they are founded on, and coincide with, the Veda. The practical effect of this distinction is, however, much lessened by the fact that the ancient sages (such as Manu), the authors of the *smṛitis*, are looked upon as having had access to Vedic texts now no longer extant, as having held communion with the gods, and as having enjoyed a clearness of intuition into divine mysteries which is denied to later mortals. Śankara, however (as shewn in pp. 97-99), does not regard all the ancients as having possessed this infallible insight into truth, but exerts all his ingenuity to explain away the claims (though sanctioned by an *Upanishad*) of Kapila, who was not orthodox, according to his Vedantic standard, to rank as an authority. In his depreciation of Kapila, however, Śankara is opposed to the *Bhāgavata Purana* and other standard works (pp. 99-100). I then proceed to observe (pp. 101-103) that though in ancient times the authors of the different philosophical systems (*Darśanas*) no doubt asserted the truth of their respective opinions, in opposition to all the antagonistic systems, yet in modern times the superior orthodoxy of the *Vedānta* appears to be

generally recognized; while the authors of the other systems are regarded, *e.g.*, by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, as, amid all their diversities, having in view, as their ultimate scope, the support of the Vedāntic theory. The same view, in substance, is taken by Vijnāna Bhixu, the commentator on the Sāṅkhya Sūtras, who (Appendix, pp. 217-226) maintains that Kapila's system, though atheistic, is not irreconcilable with the Vedānta and other theistic schools, as its denial of an Īśvara (God) is only practical, or regulative, and merely enforced in order to withdraw men from the too earnest contemplation of an eternal and perfect Deity, which would impede their study of the distinction between matter and spirit. To teach men this discrimination as the great means of attaining final liberation, is one of the two main objects, and strong points, of the Sāṅkhya philosophy, and here it is authoritative; while its atheism is admitted to be its weak side, and on this subject it has no authority. Vijnāna Bhixu goes on to say that it is even supposable that theistic systems, in order to prevent sinners from attaining knowledge, may lay down doctrines partially opposed to the Vedas; and that though in these portions they are erroneous, they will still possess authority in the portions conformable to the *śruti* and *smṛiti*. He then quotes a passage from the Padma Purāna, in which the god Siva tells his consort Pārvatī that the Vaiśeshika, the Nyāya, the Sāṅkhya, the Purva-mīmānsā Darśanas, and the Vedāntic theory of illusion, are all systems infected by the dark or *tāmasa* principle, and consequently more or less unauthoritative. All theistic theories, however, are, as Vijnāna Bhixu

considers, authoritative, and free from error on their own special subject. And as respects the discrepancy between the Sāṅkhyā and the Vedānta, regarding the unity of Soul, he concludes that the former is not devoid of authority, as the apparent diversity of Souls is acknowledged by the Vedānta, and the discriminative knowledge which the Sāṅkhyā teaches to the embodied soul is an instrument of liberation ; and thus the two varying doctrines, if regarded as the one practical (or regulative), and the other real (or transcendental), will not be contradictory.

After thus deviating into the Appendix, I revert to the close of Section ninth (pp. 103-109) where it is shewn that the distinction drawn by the Indian commentators between the superhuman Veda and its human appendages, the Kalpa Sūtras, etc., as well as the *smṛitīs*, is not borne out by certain texts which I have cited from the Vṛihad Āranyaka and Mundaka Upanishads. These two ancient treatises seem to place all the different sorts of 'śāstras or scriptures (including the four Vedas) in one and the same class, the former speaking of them all promiscuously as being the breath of Brahma, while the latter describes them all (except the Upanishads) as being parts of the "inferior science," in opposition to the "superior science," or knowledge of Brahma. In the same spirit as the Mundaka, the Chhandogya Upanishad also, as quoted in the Appendix (pp. 186, 187), includes the four Vedas in the same list with a variety of miscellaneous 'śāstras (which Nārada has studied without getting beyond the confines of exoteric knowledge), and never intimates (unless it be by placing

them at the head of the list) that the former can claim any superiority over the other works with which they are associated.

In Section tenth (pp. 107-113) the arguments in support of the Veda, adduced in the philosophical systems, and by the various commentators, as above summarised, are recapitulated, and some remarks are made on these reasonings. My observations are chiefly directed to shew that the rishis are proved by the contents of the hymns to have been their real authors; and that numerous events which have occurred *in time*, are undoubtedly mentioned in the Vedas. This, as we have seen (above, p. xiv.) is admitted by Śankara.

The Second Chapter (pp. 114-183) exhibits the opinions of the rishis in regard to the origin of the Vedic hymns. It is intended to shew in detail that, though some at least of the rishis appear to have imagined themselves to be inspired by the gods in the expression of their religious emotions and ideas, they at the same time regarded the hymns as their own compositions, or the compositions of their fore-fathers, distinguishing between them as new and old, and describing their own authorship in terms which could only have been dictated by a consciousness of its reality. The first, second, and third Sections (pp. 116-140) contain a collection of passages from the Rig-veda in which a distinction is drawn (1) between the rishis as ancient and modern, and (2) between the hymns as older and more recent; and in which (3) the rishis describe themselves as the *makers, fabricators, or generators* of the hymns; with some additional texts in

which such authorship appears to be implied, though it is not expressed. Section fourth (pp. 141-164) contains a variety of passages from the same Veda, in which (1) a superhuman character or supernatural faculties are ascribed to the earlier rishis; (2) the idea is expressed that the praises and ceremonies of the rishis were suggested and directed by the gods in general, or, in particular, by the goddess of speech, or by some other or others of the different deities of the Vedic pantheon. To illustrate, and render more intelligible and probable, the opinions which I have ascribed to the old Indian rishis, regarding their own inspiration, I have quoted (in the same Section, pp. 165-171) a number of passages from Hesiod and Homer to shew that the early Greek bards entertained a similar belief. I then advert (pp. 170-171) to the remarkable divergence between the later religious histories of Greece and of India. I next enquire briefly (in pp. 171-172) in what way we can reconcile the apparently conflicting ideas of the rishis on the subject of the hymns, considered, on the one hand, as their own productions, and, on the other, as inspired by the gods. Then follow (pp. 172-176) some further texts from the Rig-veda, in which a mystical, magical, or supernatural efficacy is ascribed to the hymns. These are succeeded (pp. 177-181) by a few quotations from the same Veda, in which the authors complain of their own ignorance; and by a reference to the contrast between these humble confessions, and the proud pretensions set up by later theologians in behalf of the Veda, and its capability of imparting universal knowledge. The ideas of the rishis regarding their own

inspiration differ widely from the conceptions of later theorists; for while the former looked upon the gods, who were confessedly *mere created beings*, as the sources of supernal illumination, the latter either regard the Veda as eternal, or refer it to the eternal Brahma, or Īśvara, as its author. The fifth and last Section (pp. 181-183) adduces some texts from the Śvetāśvatara, Mundaka and Chhāndogya Upanishads, which show the opinions of the writers regarding their own inspiration, or that of their predecessors.

I have stated above that my primary design in the composition of this work, has been to aid the researches of Indian students and their European preceptors. But the volume, with all its imperfections, may perhaps also possess a certain interest for the divine and the philosopher, as furnishing a few documents to illustrate the course of theological opinion in a sphere far removed from the ordinary observation of the European student,—a course which, quite independently of the merits of the different tenets involved in the enquiry, will, I think, be found to present a remarkable parallel in various respects to that which is traceable in the history of those religious systems with which we are most familiar. In both cases we find that a primitive age of ardent emotion, of simple faith, and of unarticulated beliefs, was succeeded by a period of criticism and speculation, when the floating materials handed down by preceding generations were compared, classified, reconciled, developed into their consequences, and elaborated into a variety of scholastic systems.

For an account of the printed works or MSS. from which my Sanskrit extracts have been made, I may refer to the Prefaces of the First and Second Parts. And sources not there mentioned, are, I think, specified in the body of the work.

In regard to the texts quoted from the Rig-veda, I have derived the same sort of assistance from the French version of M. Langlois, which has been acknowledged in the Preface to the Second Part, p. vi. I am also indebted for some of the Vedic texts to Bochtlingk and Roth's Lexicon.

In this volume, as the reader will perceive, the Sanskrit extracts are entirely printed in the Roman character. I have no abstract preference for this mode of presenting Indian words; but its adoption has saved me much labour in the way of transcription, and it has also the advantage of being somewhat more economical.

C O N T E N T S.

PAGES	
v.—xxiv.	PREFACE
1—113.	CHAPTER I OPINIONS REGARDING THE ORIGIN, DIVISION, INSPIRATION, AND AUTHORITY OF THE VEDAS, HELD BY INDIAN AUTHORS SUBSEQUENT TO THE COLLECTION OF THE HYMNS.
1—6	SECT. I. Elemental Origin of the Vedas according to the Brahmanas, Upanishads, and Institutes of Manu.
6—12	SECT. II. Origin of the Vedas according to the Vishnu and Bhāgavata Puranas, the Vṛihad Āraṇyaka Upanishad, the Harivans-a, the Mahābhārata, the Rig and Atharva Vedas, eternity of the Veda, miscellaneous statements regarding it.
12—19	SECT. III. Manu's conception of the dignity and authority of the Veda, with some statements of a different tenor from him and other writers.
20—31	SECT. IV. Division of the Vedas, according to the Vishnu, Vāyu, and Bhāgavata Puranas, and the Mahābhārata.
31—39.	SECT. V. Accounts in the Vishnu and Vāyu Puranas of the schism between the adherents of the Yajur-veda, Vaisampāyana, and Yajñavalkya, hostility of the Atharvanas towards the other Vedas, and of the Chhandogas towards the Rig-veda.
39—52.	SECT. VI. Reasonings of the Commentators on the Vedas, in support of the authority of the Vedas.
52—73.	SECT. VII. Arguments of the Mīmānsakas and Vedantins in support of the eternity and authority of the Vedas.
73—86.	SECT. VIII. Arguments of the followers of the Nyāya and Sāṅkhya systems in support of the authority of the Vedas, but against the eternity of sound, and of the Vedas.
86—107.	SECT. IX. Some further reasonings in support of the supernatural origin of the Veda, and distinction in point of authority between it and the Smritis or non-vedic Sūtras, as stated by the commentators on the Taittirīya Yajur-veda, the Pūrvā Mīmānsā, Manu, and the Vedanta.

difference of opinion between Sankara and Madhusūdana, regarding the orthodoxy of Kapila and Kapāda, the distinction in point of authority between the Vedas and the other Sāstras, drawn by later writers, not borne out by the Upanishads.

107—113. SECT. X. Recapitulation of the arguments urged in the Darsanas, and by commentators, in support of the authority of the Vedas, with some remarks on their reasonings.

114—1183. CHAPTER II. THE RISHIS, AND THEIR OPINIONS IN REGARD TO THE ORIGIN OF THE VEDIC HYMNS

116—120. SECT. I. Passages from the Hymns of the Veda which distinguish between the Rishis as Ancient and Modern.

121—128. SECT. II. Passages from the Veda in which a distinction is drawn between the older and the more recent Hymns.

128—140. SECT. III. Passages of the Rig-veda in which the Rishis describe themselves as the composers of the Hymns, or intimate nothing to the contrary

141—181. SECT. IV. Passages of the Rig-veda in which a supernatural character is ascribed to the Rishis or the Hymns, similar conceptions of inspiration entertained by the Greeks of the Homeric age, limitations of this opinion in the case of the Vedic Rishis.

181—183. SECT. V. Texts from the Upanishads, showing the opinions of the authors regarding their own inspiration, or that of their predecessors.

185—231. APPENDIX.

185—190. NOTE I. on Page 19, Line 22, containing texts from the Bhagavad Gīta, the Chhāndogya and Vṛihad Āranyaka Upanishads, and the Bhāgavata Purana, deprecatory of the ceremonial and polytheistic parts of the Veda, in comparison with the knowledge of Brahma

190. NOTE II. on Page 22, Line 14. Quotation from Mahidhara's Commentary on the Vājasaneyi Sanhīti, regarding the division of the Vedas.

190—209. NOTE III. on Page 65, 4th Line from the foot. Extracts (1) from the Sarva-darsana-sangraha, on the Mīmānsaka arguments regarding the eternity of the Veda; (2) from Sankara's Commentary on the Brahma Sūtras; and (3) from the Vidvan-moda-taranginī, attributing atheism to the Mīmānsā.

209—210. NOTE IV. on Page 80, Line 18. Extracts from the Tarka-sangraha, regarding the grounds on which the authority of the Veda, and of the other Scriptures, respectively rests. Vātsāyana's definition of the word *śāpta*, etc.

LACES

210—216. NOTE V. on Page 81, Line 13. Extracts from the *Kusumānjali*, controverting the eternity of the *Veda*, and ascribing its composition to an eternal and personal God.

216—217. NOTE VI. on Page 89, Line 12. Quotation from the *Nyāya Sūtras*, i. 49, regarding the technical term *kīlātyayāpadishṭa*.

217. NOTE VII. on Page 90, Line 19. Indication of an additional illustrative text.

217—226. NOTE VIII. on Page 103, Line 9. Extract from the *Sāukhya Prava-chana Bhāshya* (on the reconcilableness of the *Sāṅkhya* doctrines with those of the *Vedānta* and *Yoga*), embracing various quotations from the *Padma-purāna*, and other works.

226. NOTE IX. on Page 112, Line 22. Extract from *Sāyana's Introduction to R. V.*

226. NOTE X. on Page 126, Line 15. Quotation from *R. V. x. 57, 3*, == *V. S. 3, 59.*

227. NOTE XI. on Page 148, 4th Line from the foot. Reference to *R. V. x. 90, 9*, and to *A. V. xix. 54, 3*, and *xi. 7, 24.*

227. NOTE XII. on Page 149, 3rd Line from the foot. Reference to Professor Benfey's note on *S. V. ii. 294.*

227. NOTE XIII. on Page 176, Line 12. Quotations from *R. V. x. 57, 2*, and *Taittirīya Brahmana.*

228—231. ADDITIONAL NOTE on Page 5, Line 15. Extracts from *Patanjali's Mahā-bhāshya* and its commentators, and from the Preface to Prof. Goldstücker's *Mānava-kalpa-sūtra*, on the changes undergone by the *Veda* during the dissolutions of the universe.

CORRECTIONS AND EMENDATIONS.

Page 32, Line 23, *for* "Brahmavīti," *read* "Brahmarāta"
" 57, " 7, " *"yāngayadyam," read "yāngapadyam"*
" 70, " 27, " *"senapūti," read "senapati"*
" 97, " 27, " *"employs the words," read "employs the words (xii. 91)"*
" 102, " 13, " *"Brahma," read "Brahmā"*
" 112, " 33, " *"supposed," read "imagined."*
" 123, " 26, " *"pravarthe [?]," read "pravṛthe"*¹
" 140, " 35, " *"drebhyoh-dvara," read "drebhyah...dvara."*
" 158, " 31, " *"interests," read "intellects."*
" 162, " 17, " *"A. V." read "R. V."*
" 197, " 36, " *"recessus," read "regressus."*

¹ This, I find, is a correct Vedic form. See Wilson's Sanskrit Grammar, 2nd ed p. 464.

ORIGINAL SANSKRIT TEXTS.

PART THIRD.

CHAPTER I.

OPINIONS REGARDING THE ORIGIN, DIVISION, INSPIRATION, AND AUTHORITY OF THE VEDAS, HELD BY INDIAN AUTHORS SUBSEQUENT TO THE COLLECTION OF THE HYMNS.

In the preceding volume, I have furnished a general account of the ancient Indian writings, which are comprehended under the designation of Veda or Śruti. These works, which, as we have seen, constitute the earliest literature of the Hindus, are broadly divisible into two classes : (1) The Mantras or hymns, in which the praises of the gods are sung and their blessing is invoked ; (2) the Brahmanas, which embrace both the liturgical institutes in which the ceremonial application of those hymns is prescribed, and the Āranyakas and Upanishads, or theological treatises in which the spiritual aspirations which were gradually developed in the minds of the more devout of the Indian sages are preserved. It is, therefore, clear that the hymns constitute the original and, in some respects, the most essential portion of the Veda ; that the Brahmanas arose out of the hymns, and are subservient to their employment for the purposes of worship ; while the Upanishads give expression to ideas of a spiritual and mystical character which, though to some extent discoverable in the hymns and in the older portion of the Brahmanas, are much further matured, and assume a more exclusive importance, in these later treatises.

I content myself at present with referring the reader who

desires to obtain a fuller idea of the nature of the hymns, and of the attributes there ascribed to the divinities to whom they are addressed, to the late Professor H. H. Wilson's translation of the earlier portion of the Rig-veda, and to the dissertation which he has prefixed to the first volume. At a later stage of this work, I hope to return to the mythology of the Veda, and to compare the conceptions which the rishis entertained of the different objects of their worship, with those representations of the deities who bore the same names, which occur in Indian writings of a later date, whether mythological or theological.

The task to which I propose in the meantime to devote myself, is to supply some account of the opinions entertained by Hindu writers, ancient and modern, in regard to the origin and authority of the Vedas. With this view I intend to collect from the Indian writings of the later Vedic era (the Brahmanas and Upanishads) as well as from the books, whether popular or scientific, of the post-vedic period (the Puranas, the Itihasas, the institutes of Manu, the commentaries on the Vedas, the aphorisms of the Darsanas, or systems of philosophy, and their commentators) such passages as refer to the origin, division, inspiration, and authority of the Vedas, and to compare the opinions there set forth with the ideas entertained on some of these subjects by the writers of the hymns themselves, as discoverable from numerous passages in their own compositions.

The mythical accounts which are given of the origin of the Vedas are mutually conflicting. In some passages they are said to have sprung from fire, air, and the sun. In other texts they are said to have been produced by the creator Brahmā from his different mouths, or by the intervention of the Gāyatri, or to have sprung from the goddess Sarasvatī. I proceed to adduce these several passages.

SECT. I.—*Elemental origin of the Vedas according to the Brahmanas, Upanishads, and Institutes of Manu.*

I commence with a passage from the Śatapatha Brahmana, xi. 5, 8, 1 ff. *Prajāpatir vā idam agre āśit | Eka era so 'kāmayata syām prajāyeya iti | So 'srāmyat sa tapo 'tapyata | tasmāch chrāntāt tepānāt trayo loka asrīyyanta | prithiry antarixām dyauḥ | sa imāns trīn lokān abhitatāpa | tebhyaś taptebhyaś trayo vedā ajāyanta agner rigredo rāyor yajurvedaḥ sūryāt sāma-vedaḥ | sa imāns trīn vedān abhitatāpa | tebhyaś taptebhyaś trayī śukrāny ajāyanta bhūr ity rigredād bhūva iti yajurredāt svūr iti sāmavedāt | Tad rigvedenaira hotram akurvata | yajur-vedena adhvaryaram sāmavedena udgīthaṁ yad eva trayyai vidyāyai śukraṁ tena brahmaṇvam uchchakrāma.* “Prajāpati was formerly this universe [i.e. the sole existence]. Being alone, he desired, ‘may I be, may I become.’ He toiled, he performed austerity. From him, when he had so toiled, and performed austerity, three worlds were created,—earth, atmosphere, and sky. He brooded over [i.e. infused warmth into] these three worlds. From them, thus brooded over, three lights were produced,—fire, this which purifies (i.e. *parvana*, or the air), and the sun. He brooded over these three lights. From them so brooded over, the three Vedas were produced,—the Rig-veda from fire, the Yajur-veda from air, and the Sāma-veda from the sun. He brooded over these three Vedas. From them so brooded over, three seeds [or essences] were produced,—*bhūr* from the Rig-veda, *bhūrah* from the Yajur-veda, and *svār* from the Sāma-veda. Hence, with the Rig-veda they performed the function of the *hotṛi*; with the Yajur-veda, the office of the *adhvaryu*; with the Sāma-veda, the duty of the *udgatri*; while the function of the brahman arose through the essence of the triple science [i.e. the three Vedas combined].”

Chhāndogya Upanishad.—A similar passage (already quoted

in Part Second, p. 200) occurs in the Chhāndogya Upanishad (p. 288 of Dr. Röer's Ed.) *Prajāpatir lokān abhyatapat | teshāṁ tapyamānānār rasān prābrihad agnim pṛithivyā vāyum antarixād ādityam divaḥ | sa etās tisro devatā abhyatapat | tāsānār tapyamānānām rasān prābrihad agner richo vāyor ya-jūṁshi sāma ādityāt | sa etār trayīm vidyām abhyatapat | tasyās tapyamānāyā rasān prābrihad bhūr iti ṛigbhyo bhūvar iti yajur-bhyah svar iti sāmabhyah.* “Prajāpati brooded over the worlds, and from them so brooded over, he drew forth their essences, viz., fire from the earth, air from the atmosphere, and the sun from the sky. He brooded over these three deities, and from them, so brooded over, he drew forth their essences,—from fire the Rik verses, from air the Yajush verses, and from the sun the Sāma verses. He then brooded over this triple science, and from it, so brooded over, he drew forth the essences,—from Rik verses the syllable *bhūr*, from Yajush verses *bhūvah*, and from Sāma verses *svar*.¹”

Manu.—The same origin is assigned to the three Vedas in the following verses, from the account of the creation in Manu i. 21—23, where the idea is no doubt borrowed from the Brahmanas :—*Sarveshāntu sa nāmāni karmāṇicha pṛithak pṛithak | Veda-śabdebhya evādau pṛithak saṁsthāścha nirmamā | Kar-mātmanāncha devānām so 'srijat prānīnām prabhuh | sādhyā-nāncha gaṇām sūxmaṁ yajñānchaiva sanātanam | Agni-vāyu-ravibhyastu trayam brahma sanātanam | dudoha yajñasiddhyar-tham ṛig-yajuh-sāma-laxaṇam.* “He [Brahmā] in the beginning fashioned from the words of the Veda² the names, functions,

¹ Passages to the same effect are to be found in the Aitareya (v. 32—34) and Kau-shitaki Brahmanas. The latter is translated by Weber in his Ind. Stud. ii. 303, ff.

² Kullūka wrongly explains this to mean, “Having understood them from the words of the Veda (*Veda-śabdebhya eva avagamya*).” It is similarly said in the Viśnu Pur. i. 5, 58, ff. (p. 43 of Wilson's Trans.) *Nāma rūpañcha bhūtānām krityānānāha pravar-tanam | Veda-śabdebhya evādau devādinānām chakrā saḥ | rishīnām nāmadheyānī yathā-veda-śrutōni vai | yathā-niyoga-yogyāni sarveshām api so 'karot.* “In the beginning he ordained, from the words of the Veda, the names, forms, and functions of the gods and other creatures. He also assigned the names and the respective offices of all the rishis, as handed down by the Vedas.” The same idea is repeated in

and conditions of all [creatures]. That Lord also created the subtle order of active and living deities, and of Sādhyas, and eternal sacrifice. And in order to the performance of sacrifice, he drew forth from fire, from air, and from the sun, the triple eternal Veda, distinguished as Rik, Yajush, and Sāman."

Kullūka Bhāṭṭa, the commentator, annotates thus on this passage :—*Sanātanaṁ nityam | redāpaurushayatra-paxo Manor abhimatali | pūrva-halpe ye vedās te era Paramātmā-mūrtter Brahmanah sarvajñasya smṛty-ārūḍhāḥ | tān era halpādāv agni-rāyu-ravibhya āchakarsha | srautaścha ayam artho na śankariyāḥ | tathācha śrutiḥ | ‘agner rigecko vāyor yajurveda ādityāt sāmaredu’ iti.* “The word *sanātana* means ‘eternally pre-existing.’ The doctrine of the superhuman origin of the Vedas is maintained by Manu. The same Vedas which [existed] in the previous mundane era (*Kalpa*) were preserved in the memory of the omniscient Brahmā, who was one with the supreme spirit. It was those same Vedas that, in the beginning of the [present] *Kalpa*, he drew forth from fire, air, and the sun : and this dogma which is founded upon the Veda is not to be questioned, for the Veda says, ‘The Rig-veda comes from fire, the Yajur-veda from air, and the Sāma-veda from the sun.’”

Another commentator on Manu, Medhātithi, explains this passage in a more rationalistic fashion, “by remarking that the

the Mahābhārata, Sāntiparva, 8,533 :—*Rishayas tapasā redīn adhyaishanta divā-niśam | Anādinidhanā vidyā vāg utsṛiṣṭā svayambhuvā | Adau vedamayī dīvīyā yataḥ sarvāḥ pravṛittayah | Rishiṇām nāmadheyāni yāśhu vedeshu śrishtayah | Nānāru-pāñcha bhūtānām karmānāñcha pravarttayan [pravarttanam?] | Vedaśubdebhya evādau nirmimite sa ṛvarah.* “Through devotion the rishis studied the Vedas both day and night. In the beginning, wisdom, without beginning or end, divine speech, formed of the Vedas, was sent forth by Svayambhū [the self-existent] : from her all activities [are derived]. It is from the words of the Veda that that Lord in the beginning frames the names of the rishis, the creations which are [recorded?] in the Vedas, the various forms of beings, and species of works.” In his introductory verses, Mādhubha, the author of the *Vedārtha-prakāśa*, or Commentary on the Taittirīya Sanhitā, thus addresses Mahādeva :—*Yasya nivasitaṁ vedā yo vedebhyo 'khilaṁ jagat | Nirmame tam ahaṁ vande vidyātirtham Maheśvaram.* “I reverence Mahesvara, the hallowed abode of sacred knowledge, whose breath the Vedas are, and who from the Vedas formed the whole universe.” We shall meet this idea again further on.

Rig-veda opens with a hymn to fire, and the Yajur-veda with one in which air is mentioned."—Colebr. Misc. Ess. i. p. 11, note.

To the verses from Manu (i. 21—23) just cited, the following from the second book may be added, partly for the purpose of completing the parallel with the passages previously adduced from the Śatapatha Brahmana and the Chhāndogya Upanishad ; —Manu ii. 76, ff. *Akārañchāpy ukārañcha makārañcha Prajāpatih | Vedatravayād niraduhad bhūr-bhuvaḥ-srar itīti cha |* 77. *Tribhya eva tu vedebhyāḥ pādam pādam adūduhat | tad ity rīcho'syāḥ sāvitryāḥ paramcshṭhī prajāpatih | . . . 81. Oṁkāra-pūrvikās tisro mahāryāhritayo 'vyayāḥ | Tripadā chāira gāyatrī vijñeyam brahmaṇo mukham.* 76. "Prajāpati also milked out of the three Vedas the letters *a*, *u*, and *m*, together with the words *bhūr*, *bhuvaḥ*, and *svar*. 77. The same supreme Prajāpati also milked from each of the three Vedas one of the [three] lines of the text called *sāvitri* [or *gāyatrī*], beginning with the word *tad*.³ 81. The three great imperishable particles (*bhūr*, *bhuvaḥ*, *svar*) preceded by *om*, and the *gāyatrī* of three lines, are to be regarded as the mouth of the Veda [or Brahma]."

SECT. II.—*Origin of the Vedas according to the Vishnu and Bhāgavata Puranas, the Vṛihad Āranyaka Upanishad, the Harivansā, the Mahābhārata, the Rig and Atharva Vedas; eternity of the Veda; miscellaneous statements regarding it.*

In the Vishnu and Bhāgavata Puranas we find a quite different tradition regarding the origin of the Vedas, which in these works are said to have been created by the four-faced Brahma from his several mouths. Thus the Vishnu Pur. says, i. 5, 48, ff. :—*Gāyatrañcha rīchaśchaiva trivṛit-sāma-rathantaram | Agnishtomañcha yajñānām nirmame prathamād mukhāt | ya-jūṁshi traishṭubhaṁ chhandaḥ stomaṁ pañchadaśām tathā | Vṛihat sāma tathokthañcha daxinād asrījad mukhāt | sāmāni jagatīchhandah stomaṁ saptadaśām tathā | vairūpam atirātra-*

³ This text, Rig-veda iii. 62, 10, will be quoted in the sequel.

cha paśchimād asrījad mukhāt | ekaviṁśam atharvānam āptor-yāmānam evacha | Anushtubhaṁ sa vairājam uttarād asrījad mukhāt. “From his first mouth Brahma formed the *gayātra*, the *r̥ik* verses, the *trivrit*, the *sāma-rathantara*. From his southern mouth he created the *yajush* verses, the *trishṭubh* metre, the *panchadaśa-stoma*, the *vrihat-sāma*, and the *ukthas*. From his western mouth he formed the *sāma* verses, the *jagatī* metre, the *saptadasū-stoma*, the *rairūpa*, and the *atirātra*. From his northern mouth he framed the *ekarinśa*, the *atharvan*, with the *anushtubh* and *rīrāj* metres.”⁴

In like manner it is said, but with variations, in the Bhāgavata Purana iii. 12, 34, and 37 ff.:—*Kadāchid dhyāyatul̥ srashṭur vedā āsaṁś chaturmukhāt | kathaṁ sraxyāmyahaṁ lokān samavetān yathā purā | . . . R̥ig-yajuḥ-sāmātharrākhyān vedān pūrvālibhir mukhaiḥ | śastram iṣyān stutistomam prāyaschittam vyadhāt kramāt.* “Once the Vedas sprang from the four-faced creator, as he was meditating ‘how shall I create the aggregate worlds as before?’ . . . He formed from his eastern and other mouths the Vedas called *R̥ik*, *Yajush*, *Sāman*, and *Atharvan*, together with praise, sacrifice, hymns, and expiation.” And in verse 45 it is stated that the *ushṇih* metre issued from his hairs, the *gāyatrī* from his skin, the *trishṭubh* from his flesh, the *anushtubh* from his tendons, the *jagatī* from his bones.” (*Tasyoṣhnīg āśil lomebhyo gayatrīcha trachō vibhoh | trishṭup māṁsāt snuto 'nushṭup jagaty asthnah Prajāpateḥ.*)

Vrihad Āranyaka.—According to the following passage of the *Vrihad Āranyaka* Upanishad (p. 455 of Röer's Ed. and p. 179 of Trans.=Śatapatha Brahmana, p. 1064) the Vedas, as well as other *sāstras* are the breath of Brahma:—*Sa yathā ārdrendhāgnē abhyāhitāt pṛithag dhūmā viñścharanti evāṁ vā are 'syā mahato bhūtasya niśvasitam etad yad ṛigvedo yajurvedaḥ sāma-redo 'tharvāṅgirasa itihāsaḥ purāṇām vidyā upanishadaḥ ślokāḥ*

⁴ See Wilson's Trans. p. 42. As it is sufficient for my purpose that certain parts of the different Vedas are intended by the several terms employed in this passage, I have left them all untranslated.

sutrāny anuvyākhyānāni vyākhyānāni asyaiva etāni sarvāṇi niśvasitāni. “As from a fire made of moist wood various modifications of smoke proceed, so is the breathing of this great Being the Rig-veda, the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, the Atharvāṅgi-rases, the Itihāsas, Puranas, science, the Upanishads, verses (*slokas*), aphorisms, comments of different kinds—all these are his breathings.”⁵

It is curious that in this passage the Vedas appear to be classed in the same category with various other works, such as the Śūtras, from some at least of which (as we shall see further on), they are broadly distinguished by later writers, who regard the former (including the Brahmanas and Upanishads) as of superhuman origin, while this character is expressly denied to the latter, which are represented as *paurusheya*, or merely human compositions.

Harivansā.—In the first section of the *Harivansā*, v. 47, the creation of the Vedas by Brahmā is thus briefly alluded to:—
Rīcho yajūṁshi sāmāni nirmame yajñusiddhaye | sādhyās tair ayajan derān ity evam anuśuśruma. “In order to the accomplishment of sacrifice, he formed the Rik, Yajush, and Sāma verses: with these the Sādhyās worshipped the gods, as we have heard.”

The following is a more particular account of the same event given in another part of the same work; *Harivansā*, verse 11,516 :—*Tato 'srijad rai tripadām gāyatrīm vedamātaram | Akarochchhaira chaturo vedān gāyatri-sambhavān.* After framing the world, Brahmā “next created the *gāyatrī* of three lines,

⁵ In another part of the same Upanishad (pp. 50—53 of Dr. Röer's Ed.) Prajapati [identified with Death, or the Devourer] is said to have produced *vāch* (speech), and through her, together with Soul, to have created all things, including the Vedas:—*sa tayā vāchā tena ātmanā idāñ sarvam asrijata yad idāñ kiñcha rīcho yajūṁshi sāmāni chhandāñsi yajñān prajāḥ paśūn.* “By that speech and that soul he created all things whatsoever, Rik, Yajush, and Sāma texts, metres, sacrifices, creatures, animals.” And in a subsequent text of the same work (p. 290) it is said:—*Trayo vedā ete eva | vīgeva rig-vedo mano yajur-vedah prānah sāma-vedah.* “The three Vedas are [identifiable with] these three things [speech, mind, and life]. Speech is the Rig-veda; mind the Yajur-veda; and life, the Sāma-veda.”

mother of the Vedas, and also the four Vedas which sprang from the *gāyatrī*."

A little further on we find this expanded into the following piece of mysticism, verse 11,665, ff.:—*Samāhita-manā Brāhma moxaprāptena hetunā | chandra-mandala-saṁsthānāj jyotistējo mahat tadā | Pravīśya hṛidayāṁ xipraṁ gāyatrīyā nayanāntare | Garbhasya sambharo yaścha chaturdhā purushātmakāḥ | Brāhma-tcjomayo 'ryaktaḥ śāscato 'tha dhruro 'ryayāḥ | na chendriya-guṇair yukto yuktas tejoguṇena cha | chandrāṁśu-vimala-prakhyo bhrājishnur varṇa-saṁsthitah | Netrābhyaṁ janayad deca ṛig-vedāṁ yajushā saha | sāmavedāñcha jihrāgrād atharvāñcha mūrddhataḥ | Jātamātrāstu te vedaḥ xetraṁ vindanti tattcatāḥ | Tena veditvam āpannā yasmād vindanti tatpadaṁ | Te srijānti tadā redū brahma pūrvaṁ sanātanam | Purushāṁ divyarūpābhaṁ svaih svair bhāvair manobhavaiḥ.* “For the emancipation of the world, Brāhma, sunk in contemplation, issuing in a luminous form from the region of the moon, penetrated into the heart of Gāyatrī, entering between her eyes. From her there was then produced a quadruple being, lustrous as Brāhma, indistinct, and eternal, undecaying, devoid of bodily senses or qualities, distinguished by the attribute of brilliancy, pure as the rays of the moon, radiant, and embodied in letters. The god fashioned the Rig-veda, with the Yajush, from his eyes, the Sāma-veda from the tip of his tongue, and the Atharvan from his head. These Vedas, as soon as they are born, find a body (*xetra*). Hence they obtain their character of *Vedas*, because they *find* (*vindanti*) that abode. These Vedas then create the pre-existent eternal brahma (sacrifice or ceremonial), a being of celestial form, with their own mind-born qualities.”

I extract another passage on the same subject from a later section of the same work, verses 12,425, ff. When the Supreme Being was intent on creating the universe, Hiranyagarbha, or Prajāpati, issued from his mouth, and was desired to divide himself,—a process which he was in great doubt how he should

effect. The text then proceeds :—*Iti chintayatas tasya om ity
crotthitah svarak | sa bhumāv antarīxe cha nāke cha kṛitarān
svanam | Tañchaitrābhyaśatas tasya manah-sāramayam punah |
hṛidayād deva-devasya vashaṭkārah samutthitaḥ | bhūmyanta-
rīxa-nākānām bhūyah svaratmakāḥ parāḥ | mahāsnritimayāḥ
punyā mahāryāhṛitayo 'bhāvan | chandasām pravarā devī cha-
turviṁśāxarā 'bhāvat | Tatpadam saṁsmaran dīryam sāvitrīm
akarot prabhuh | rik-sāmātharva-yajushas̄ chaturo bhagavān
prabhuh | chakāra nikhilān redān brahmayuktena karmanā.*

“ While he was thus reflecting, the sound *om* issued from him, and resounded throughout the earth, atmosphere, and sky. While the God of gods was again and again repeating this, the essence of the mind, the *vashaṭkāra* proceeded from his heart. Next, the sacred *ryāhritis* (*bhūr, bhuvah, svar*) formed of the great *smṛiti*, the most excellent emblems of earth, atmosphere, and sky were produced. Then appeared the goddess, the most excellent of metres, with twenty-four syllables [the *gāyatrī*]. Reflecting on the divine text [beginning with] *tad*, the Lord formed the *sāvitrī*. He then produced all the Vedas, the Rik, Sāman, Atharvan, and Yajush, with their prayers and rites.” (See also the passage from the Bhāg. Pur. xii. 6, 37, ff., which will be quoted in a following section.)

Mahābhārata.—The Mahābhārata in one passage speaks of the goddess Sarasvatī as the mother of the Vedas. Śānti P. verse 12,920 :—*Vedānām mātaraṇ paśya matsthām devīn Saras-
vatīm.* “ Behold Sarasvatī, mother of the Vedas, abiding in me.”

I will add here two passages, of a somewhat similar character, from the Rik and Atharva Sanhitās, though they ought, strictly speaking, to have been reserved for the next chapter.

Rig-veda.—In the 9th verse of the Purusha Sūkta (already quoted in Part First, pp. 7 and 8), the three Vedas are said to have been derived from the mystical victim Purusha. “ From that universal sacrifice were produced the hymns called Rik and Sāman, the metres, and the Yajush.”

Atharva-veda.—In regard to the origin of two of the Vedas.

the Atharva-veda says, xix. 54, 3 :—*Käläd richah samabhavan yajuh käläd ajāyata.* “From time the Rik verses sprang ; the Yajush sprang from time.”⁶

Manu.—According to the verses in Manu, xii. 49, 50, quoted in Part First of this work, p. 18, the Vedas, with the other beings and objects named along with them, constitute the *second* manifestation of the *sattru guna*, or pure principle ; while Brahmā is placed in a higher rank, as one of the *first* manifestations of the same principle. The word *Veda* in this passage is explained by Kullūka of those “embodied deities, celebrated in the Itihāsas, who preside over the Vedas.” (*Vedābhimāninyaścha devatā vigrahavatya itihāsa-prasiddāḥ.*)

Vishnu Purana.—At the end of Section 6 of the third book of the V. P. (p. 285 of Wilson’s Trans.) we have the following assertion of the eternity of the *Veda* :—*Iti śākhāḥ prasāṅkhyātāḥ śākhābhedāḥ tathairācha | karttāraschāiva śākhānām bhedahetus tathoditah | sarramanvantareshvera śākhābhedāḥ samāḥ smṛitāḥ | Prājāpatyā śrutiḥ nityā tadeikalpāḥ tv imē dvija.* “Thus the Śākhās, their divisions, their authors, and the cause of the division have been declared. In all the manvantaras the divisions of the Śākhās are recorded to be the same. The *śruti* (*Veda*) derived from Prajāpati (Brahmā) is eternal : these, o Brahman, are only its modifications.”

In another passage of the same book, Vishnu is identified with the *Vedas*. *Vish. Pur.* iii. 3, 19 ff. (Wilson, p. 274) :—*Sa ringmayāḥ sāmamayah sa chātmā sa yajurmayāḥ | rig-yajuh-sāma-sārātmā sa evātmā śārīrinām | sa bhidyate vedamayah sa vedaṁ karoti bhedair bahubhiḥ saśākham | śākhāpranetā sa samastaśākhā jñānasvarūpo bhagarān anantah.* “He is composed of the Rik, of the Sāman, of the Yajush ; he is the soul. Consisting of the essence of the Rik, Yajush, and Sāman, he is the soul of

⁶ The *Vishnu Purana*, 1, 2, 13 (Wilson’s Trans. p. 9), says :—*Tad eva sarvam evaitad vyaktāvyaktaśvarūpavat | Tathā purusharūpena kālarūpena cha sthitam.* “This Brahma is all this universe, existing both as the indiscrete and the discrete ; existing also in the form of *Purusha* and of *Kāla* (time).”

embodied spirits. Formed of the Veda, he is divided ; he forms the Veda and its branches (*sākhās*) into many divisions. Framer of the Śākhās, he is also their entirety, the infinite lord, whose essence is knowledge."

SECT. III.—*Manu's conception of the dignity and authority of the Veda, with some statements of a different tenor from him and other writers.*

Manu employs the following honorific expressions in reference to the Vedas (xii. 94 ff.) :— *Pitṛi-derā-manushyāñām vedaś chaxuh sanātanam | asūkyāñchāprameyañcha veda-śāstrum iti sthitih || Yā veda-vākyāḥ smṛituyo yāścha kāścha kudriṣṭayah | sarvās tā nishphalāḥ pretya tamonishṭhā hi tāḥ smṛitah || Utpadyante chyavante cha yāny ato 'nyāni kānicchit | Tāny arvāk-kālikatayā⁸ nishphalāny anṛitāni cha || Chāturvarṇyāñ trayo lokāś chatvāraś chāśramāḥ pṛithak | Bhūtam bharat bharishyāñcha sarvaṁ vedāt prasiddhyati || śabdaḥ sparsāścha rūpuñcha raso gandhaścha pañchamāḥ | vedād eva prasiddhyanti prasūti-guṇa-karmataḥ || Bibhartti⁹ sarva-bhūtāni veda-śāstraṁ sanātanam | Tasmād etat param manye yoj jantor asya sādhnam || Saināpatyañcha rājyañcha dānda-netrītum eva cha | sarva-lokādhipatyāñcha veda-śāstra-vid arhati || Yathā jāta-balo vahnir dahyaty ārdrān api drumān | tathā dahati vedajñāḥ karmajāñ dosham ātmānaḥ | veda-śāstrārtha-tattvajño yatra tatrāśrame vusun | Ihaiva loke tishṭhan sa brahmabhūyāyu kalpate.* “The Veda is the eternal eye of the patriarchs, of gods, and of men ; it is beyond human power and comprehension ;

⁷ *Driṣṭārtha-vākyōni ‘chaityavandanāt svargo bhavati’ ity ādīni yāni cha asat-tarka-mūlāni devatā-‘pūrvvādi-nirvākarāṇyātmaṅkāni veda-viruddhāni chārvāka-dariā-nāni* :—“ That is, deductions from experience of the visible world ; such doctrines as that ‘heaven is attained by obeisance to a chaitya,’ and similar Chārvāka tenets founded on false reasonings, contradicting the existence of the gods, and the efficacy of religious rites, and contrary to the Vedas.”—Kullūka.

⁸ *Idānintanatvāt*. “ From their modernness.”—Kullūka.

⁹ *Havir agnau hūyate, so ‘agniś ādityam upasarpati, tat sūryo rāśmībhir varshati, tenānnam bhavati, atheha bhūtānām utpatti-sthitischeti havir jāyate iti brāhmaṇam.* “ The oblation is cast into the fire ; fire reaches the sun ; the sun causes rain by his rays ; thence food is produced ; thus the oblation becomes the cause of the generation and maintenance of creatures ; so says a Brahmana.”—Kullūka.

this is a certain conclusion. Whatever traditions are apart from the Veda, and all heretical views, are fruitless in the next world, for they are declared to be founded on darkness. All other [books] external to the Veda, which arise and pass away, are worthless and false from their recentness of date. The system of the four castes, the three worlds, the four states of life, all that has been, now is, or shall be, is made manifest by the Veda. The objects of touch and taste, sound, form, and odour, as the fifth, are made known by the Veda, together with their products, qualities, and the actions they occasion. The eternal Veda supports all beings: hence I regard it as the principal instrument of well-being to this creature, man. Command of armies, royal authority, the administration of criminal justice, and the sovereignty of all worlds, he alone deserves who knows the Veda. As fire, when it has acquired force, burns up even green trees, so he who knows the Veda consumes the taint of his soul which has been contracted from works. He who comprehends the essential meaning of the Veda, in whatever order of life he may be, is prepared for absorption into Brahma, even while abiding in this lower world."

The following are some further miscellaneous passages of the same tenor, scattered throughout the Institutes (Manu ii. 10 ff.):—*Śrutiſtu redo rījñeyo dharma-śastrantu rai smritih | te sarvār-theshv amīmāṁsye tābhyaṁ dharmo hi nirbabhau | 11. Yo 'ramanyeta te mūlc hetu-śastrāśrayād dvijah | sa sādhubhir vahishkāryyo nāstiko vedanindakah | 13. . . . Dharmāñ jijñāsa-mānānām pramāṇam paramāñ śrutiḥ.* “By śruti is meant the Veda, and by smṛiti the institutes of law: the contents of these are not to be questioned by reason, since from them [a knowledge of] duty has shone forth. The Brahman who, relying on rationalistic treatises,¹⁰ shall contemn these two primary sources

¹⁰ This, however, must be read in conjunction with the precept in xii. 106, which declares:—*ārshaṁ dharmopadeśāneha veda-śūstrārirodhīnā | yaś tarkenānusandhatte sa dharmāñ veda nāparah.* “He, and he only is acquainted with duty, who investigates the injunctions of the rishis, and the precepts of the smṛiti, by reasonings which do not contradict the Veda.”

of knowledge, must be excommunicated by the virtuous as a sceptic and reviler of the Vedas. . . . 13. To those who are seeking a knowledge of duty, the *śruti* is the supreme authority."

In the following passage, the necessity of a knowledge of Brahma is asserted, though the practice of ritual observances is also inculcated (vi. 82, ff.) :— *Dhyānikañ sarvam craitad yad etad abhiśabditam | nu hy anadhyātma-vit kaśchit kriyāphalam upāśnute | adhiyajñam brahma japed ādhidaivikam eva cha | ādhyatmikañcha satatañ vedāntābhīhitañcha yat | Idam śaraṇam ajñānām idam eva rījānatām | idam unrichchhatām svargam idam ānāntyam ichchhatām.* "All this which has been now declared is dependant on devout meditation : no one who is ignorant of the supreme spirit can reap the fruit of ceremonial acts. Let a man repeat texts relating to sacrifice, texts relating to deities, texts relating to the supreme spirit, and whatever is declared in the Vedānta. This [Veda] is the refuge of the ignorant, as well as of the understanding ; it is the refuge of those who are seeking after paradise, as well as of those who are desiring infinity."

The following text breathes a moral spirit, by representing purity of life as essential to the reception of benefit from religious observances (ii. 97) :— *Vedās tyāgaścha yajñāścha niyamāścha tapāṁsi cha | na viprodaushṭa-bhārasya siddhīm gachhanti karchi-chit.* "The Vedas, almsgiving, sacrifices, observances, austerities, are ineffectual to a man of depraved disposition."

The doctrine which may be drawn from the following lines does not seem so favourable to morality (xi. 261, ff.) :— *Hatvā lokān apīmāñs trīn aśnann api yatastataḥ | Rigvedaṁ dhārayan vipro nainah prāpnōti kiñchana | Riksāṁhitāṁ trīr abhyasya yajushāṁ vā samāhitāḥ | sāmnāṁ vā sarahasyānāṁ sarvapāpaḥ pramuchyate | yathā mahā-hradam prāpya xiptam loshtāṁ vinaś-yati | tathā duścharitaṁ sarvaṁ vede trivṛiti majjati.* "A Brahman who should destroy these three worlds, and eat food received from any quarter whatever, would incur no guilt if he retained in his memory the [whole] Rig-veda. Repeating thrice

with intent mind the sanhitā of the Rik, or the Yajush, or the Sāman, with the Upanishads, he is freed from all his sins. Just as a clod thrown into a great lake is dissolved when it touches the water, so does all sin sink in the triple Veda."

Considering the sacredness ascribed in the preceding passages to all the Vedas, the epithet applied to the Sāma-veda in the second of the following verses is remarkable (Manu iv. 123, ff.): *Sāmadhvānār rigyajushī nādhīyita kadāchana | redasyādhītya vā'py antam āranyakam adhītya cha | Rigredo deradaivatyō yajurvedastu mānushah | Sāmavedah smṛitah pitryas tasmat tasyāśuchir dhvanih.* "Let no one read the Rik or the Yajush while the Sāman is sounding in his ears, or after he has read the conclusion of the Veda (*i.e.* the Vedānta) or an Āranyaka. The Rig-veda has the gods for its deities, the Yajur-veda has men for its objects, the Sāma-veda has the pitris for its divinities, wherefore its sound is impure."

The scholiast Kullūka, however, will not allow that the Sāma-veda can be "really impure." "It has," he says, "only a semblance of impurity" (*tasmāt tasya aśuchir iva dhvaniḥ | na tv aśuchir eva*). In this remark he evinces the tendency, incident to many systematic theologians, to ignore all those features of the sacred text on which they are commenting which are at variance with their theories regarding its absolute perfection. As it was the opinion of his age that the Veda was eternal and divine, it was, he considered, impossible that impurity or any species of fault could be predicated of any of its parts; and every expression, even of the highest authorities, which contradicted this opinion, had to be explained away. I am not in a position to state how this notion of impurity came to be attached to the Sāma-veda. The passage perhaps proceeded from the adherents of some particular Vedic school adverse to the Sāma-veda; but its substance being found recorded in some earlier work, it was deemed of sufficient authority to find a place in the miscellaneous collection of precepts,—gathered no doubt from different quarters, and perhaps not always strictly con-

sistent with each other,—which make up the Manava-dharma-śāstra.

Vishnu Purana.—The following passage from the Vishnu Purana, at the close, ascribes the same character of impurity to the Sāma-veda, though on different grounds, Vish. Pur. ii. 11, 5 (Wilson, p. 235) :—*Yā tu śaktih parā Vishnor ṛig-yajuh-sāma-sañjñitā | saishā trayī tapaty aṁho jagutaścha hinasti yat | saira Vishṇuh sthitah sthityāṁ jagataḥ pālanodyataḥ | ṛig-yajuh-sāma-bhūto 'ntah saritur drija tishthati | māsi māsi ravir yo yus tatra tatra hi sā parā | trayīmayī Vishṇu-śaktir avasthānam karoti rai | Richas tapanti pūrvāhne madhyāhne 'tha yajūñshy atha | vrihad-rathantaraṁdīni sāmāny ahnāḥ xaye ravau | angam eshā trayī Vishṇor ṛig-yajuh-sāma-sañjñitā | Vishṇu-śaktir avasthānam māsāditye karoti sā | na kevalāṁ ravau śaktir vaishṇari sā trayīmayī | Brahmā 'tha Purusho Rudras trayam etat trayīmayam | sargādāv ṛīgmayo Brahmā sthitau Vishṇur yajurmayaḥ | Rudraḥ sānamayo 'ntāya tasmāt tasyāśuchir dhvanīḥ.* “The supreme energy of Vishnu, called the Rik, Yajush, and Sāman—this triad burns up sin and all things injurious to the world. During the continuance of the world, this triad exists as Vishnu, who is occupied in the preservation of the universe, and in the form of the Rik, Yajush, and Sāman, abides within the sun. That supreme energy of Vishnu, consisting of the triple Veda, dwells in the particular form of the sun, which presides over each month. The Rik verses shine in the morning sun, the Yajush verses in his meridian beams, and the Vrihad rathantara and other Sāma verses in his declining rays. This triple Veda is the body of Vishnu, and this his energy abides in the monthly sun. But this energy of Vishnu, formed of the triple Veda, does not reside in the sun alone; Brahmā, Purusha (Vishnu), and Rudra also constitute a triad formed of the triple Veda. At the creation, Brahmā is formed of the Rig-veda; during the continuance of the universe, Vishnu is composed of the Yajur-veda; and for the destruction of the worlds, Rudra is made up of the Sāma-veda; hence the sound of this Veda is impure.”

Vayu Purana.—Other passages also may be found in works not reputed to be heretical, in which the Vedas, or particular parts of them, are not spoken of with the same degree of respect as they are by Manu. Thus the *Vāyu Purana* gives precedence to the Puranas over the Vedas in the order of creation (i. 56¹¹):—*Prathamaṁ sarva-sastraṇāṁ Purāṇāṁ Brahmanā smritam | anantarañcha raktrebhyo vedās tasya viṇissṛtāḥ*. “First of all the Sastras, the Purana was uttered by Brahmanā. Subsequently the Vedas issued from his mouths.”

The same Purana says further on in the same section (p. 50 of Dr. Aufrecht's Catalogue):—*Yo ridyāch chaturo redān sāṅgopanishado drijah | na chet purāṇāṁ saṁridyād naira sa syād vicharanyaḥ | Itihāsa-purāṇābhyaṁ redān samupariyāḥ hayet | vibhety alpaśrūtād vedo mām ayām praharishyati*. “He who knows the four Vedas, with their supplements and Upanishads, is not really learned, unless he know also the Puranas. Let a man, therefore, complete the Vedas by adding the Itihasas and Puranas. The Veda is afraid of a man of little learning, lest he should treat it injuriously.”

Brahma-vairaratta Purana.—The Brahna-vaiwartta Purana asserts in a yet more audacious manner its own superiority to the Veda (i. 48 ff.):—*Bharagan yat trayā pṛishṭām jñātām sarvam abhīṣitam | sārabhūtām purāṇeṣhu Brahma-vairarattam uttamam | Purāṇopapurāṇānāṁ redānām bhrama-bhañjanam*. “That about which, venerable sage, you have inquired, is all known by me, the essence of the Puranas, the pre-eminent Brahna-vaiwartta, which refutes the errors of the Puranas and Upapuranas, and of the Vedas.” (Aufrecht's Cat. p. 21.)

In the following passage also, from the commencement of the Mundaka Upanishad, the Vedic hymns (though a divine origin, would no doubt be allowed to them¹²) are at all events depre-

¹¹ P. 48 of Dr. Aufrecht's Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

¹² In fact the following verses (4 and 6) occur in the second chapter of the same Mund. Up.:—4. *Agnir mūrdhā chaxushī chandrasūryyau diśāḥ śrotre vāg vivṛtāścha vedāḥ | vāgyuḥ prūṇo hṛidayām viśvam asya padbhyaṁ prithivī hy esha sarva-*

ciated, by being classed among other works as part of the inferior science, in contrast to the Brahmu-vidyā or knowledge of Brahma, the highest of all knowledge, which is expressly ascribed to Brahman as its author :—1. *Brahmā devānām prathamaḥ sambabhūra vīśasya karttā bhuvanasya goptā | sa brahma-vidyām sarravida-pratishṭhām Atharvāya jyeshthaputrāya prāha |* 2. *Atharvāne yām pravadeta Brahmanā Atharrā tām purovāch' Āngire brahma-vidyām | sa Bhāradrājāya Satyavāhāya prāha Bhāradrāvo 'ngirase parārām |* 3. *Śaunako ha rai Mahāsālo 'ngirasaṁ vidhīrad upapannah prapachcha | hasmin nu bhagaro viñjāte sarvam idām viñjātam bharatīti |* 4. *Tasmāi sa hovācha | dve vidye reditareye iti ha sma yad brahma-riḍo vadanti parā chairāpara cha |* 5. *Patrāparā ṛigvedo yajurvedah sāmarcdo 'tharvaredah śixā kulpō ryākaranyaṁ niruktaṁ chhando jyotiṣham iti | atha parā yayā tad axaram adhigamyate.* “Brahman was produced the first among the gods, maker of the universe, preserver of the world. He revealed to his eldest son Atharvan, the science of Brahman, the support of all knowledge. 2. Atharvan of old declared to Angis this science, which Brahman had unfolded to him; and Angis, in turn, explained it to Satyavāha, descendant of Bharadvāja, who delivered this traditional lore [or the higher and lower science] to Angiras. 3. Śaunaka, the great householder, approaching Angiras in due form, inquired, ‘What is that, O venerable sage, through the knowledge of which all this [universe] becomes known?’ 4. [Angiras] answered, ‘Two sciences are to be known—this is what the sages acquainted with Brahma declare—the superior and the inferior. 5. The inferior [consists of] the Rig-veda, the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, the Atharva-veda, accentuation, ritual, *bhūtāntarātmā | . . . 6. Tasmād richah sūma yajūñshi dīxī yajñāścha sarve krataro daxināścha | sainrat-sarāñcha yajamānaścha lokūḥ somo yatra pavate yatra sūryaḥ.* “Agni is his [Brahma’s] head, the sun and moon are his eyes, the four points of the compass are his ears, the uttered Vedas are his voice, the air is his breath, the universe is his heart, the earth issued from his feet: he is the inner soul of all creatures. . . From him came the Rik verses, the Sāman, the Yajush verses, initiatory rites, all oblations, sacrifices, and gifts, the year, the sacrificer, and the worlds where the moon and sun purify.”

grammar, commentary, prosody, and astronomy. The superior science is that by which the imperishable is comprehended.””

It is to be remarked that in this passage (verse 5) as in that already quoted above (p. 7) from the Vṛihad Āryanyaka Upaniṣad, the most essential parts of the Vedas, the sanhitās, are classed in the same category with the Kalpa or ceremonial institutes, and other works, from which they are separated by a broad line of demarcation in the works of later writers.

The following passage from the Katha Upanishad (ii. 23) is of a somewhat similar tenor (p. 107 of Roer's ed. and p. 106 of Eng. trans.) :—*Nāyam ātmā pravachanena labhyo na medhayā na bahunā śrutena | yam evaisha r̥inute tena labhyas tasyaisha ātmā r̥inute tanūm srām.* “This soul is not to be attained by tradition, nor by understanding, nor by much scripture. He is attainable by him whom he chooses. The soul chooses that man's body as his own.”

The scholiast interprets thus the first part of this text :—*Yadyapi durvijñeyo 'yam ātmā tathāpy upāyena survijñeyya eva ity āha nāyam ātmā pravachanena aneka-veda-srīkaraṇena labhyo jñeyo nāpi medhayā granthārtha-dhāraṇā-śaktyā na bahunā śrutena keralena | kena tarhi labhya ity uchyate.* “Although this soul is difficult to know, still it may easily be known by the use of proper means. This is what [the author] proceeds to say. This soul is not to be attained, known, by tradition, by the acknowledgment of many Vedas ; nor by understanding, by the power of recollecting the contents of books ; nor by much scripture alone. By what, then, is it to be attained ? This he declares.”

It is not necessary to follow the scholiast into the Vedantic explanation of the rest of the passage.¹³

¹³ See Prof. Müller's *Anc. Sans. Lit.* 1st ed. p. 320, and p. 109.

SECT. IV.—*Division of the Vedas, according to the Vishnu, Vāyu, and Bhāgavata Puranas, and the Mahābhārata.*

The Vishnu Purana gives the following account of the division of the Veda, described as having been originally but one, into four parts, iii. 2, 18 (see Wilson's Trans. p. 270):—*Krite yuge paraṁ jñānam Kapilādi-srarūpa-dhṛik | dadāti sarva-bhūtānām sarva-bhūtahite rataḥ | chakravartri-srarūpcṇa Tretāyām api sa prabhuh | Dushtānār nigrahaṁ kurran paripāti jagat-trayam | Vedam ekaṁ chaturbhedaṁ kṛitrā śākhā-śatair vibhuḥ | karoti bahulam bhūyo Vedāryāsa-svarūpa-dhṛik | vedāṁs tu drāpare ryasya, etc.* “In the Krita age, Vishnu, devoted to the welfare of all creatures, assumes the form of Kapila and others to confer upon them the highest knowledge. In the Tretā age, the Supreme Lord, in the form of a universal potentate, represses the violence of the wicked, and protects the three worlds. Assuming the form of Vyāsa, the all-pervading Being repeatedly divides the single Veda into four parts, and multiplies it by distributing it into hundreds of śākhās. Having thus divided the Vedas in the Dvāpara age,” etc.

This is repeated more at length in the following section (Vish. Pur. iii. 3, 4 ff.):—*Veda-drumasya Maitreya śākhābhedaḥ sahasraśaḥ | na śakyō ristaro raktum saṁcepeṇa srimushra tam | Dvāpare Dvāpare Vishṇur Vyāsarūpī mahāmune | Vedam ekaṁ sa bahudhā kurute jaguto hitaḥ | vīryaṁ tejo balañchālpam manushyānām acarya rai | hitāya sarabhūtānām reda-bhedān karoti saḥ | yayā sa kurute tanvā redam ekaṁ prithak prabhuh | Vedāryāsābhidhānā tu sā mārttir Madhuvidvishaḥ | . . . Ashtā-viñśati-kṛite vai redā vyastā maharshibhūḥ | Vairasrate 'ntare tasmin Dvāpareshu punah punah.* “It is not possible, Maitreya, to describe in detail the tree of the Vedas with its thousand branches (śākhās); but listen to a summary. A friend to the world, Vishnu, in the form of Vyāsa, divides the single Veda into many parts. He does so for the good of all creatures, because he perceives the vigour, energy, and strength of men to

be now but limited. Vedavyāsa, in whose person he performs this division, is an impersonation of the enemy of Madhu (Vishnu). . . . Eight-and-twenty times in the Dvāpara ages of this Vaivas-vata manvantara¹⁴ have the Vedas been divided by great sages." These sages are then enumerated, and Krishna Dvaipayana¹⁵ is the twenty-eighth.

The subject is resumed at the beginning of the next section (Vish. Pur. iii. 4, 1 ff.):—*Ādyo redaś chatushpādaḥ śata-sāhasra-sammitaḥ | Tato daśa-guṇaḥ kṛtsno yajño 'yaṁ sarva-kāma-dhuk | Tato 'tra matsuto Vyāso 'shtāriṁśatitame 'ntare | redam ekam chatushpādaṁ chaturdhā ryabhujaḥ prabhuh | yathā tu tena vai ryastā Vedavyāsenā dhīmatā | Vedās tathā samastais tair ryastā Vyāsais tathā mayā | tad anenaica vedānām śākhā-bhedān drījottama | chaturyugeshu rachitān samastesheva avadhāraya | Krishna-draipāyanām Vyāsam viddhi Nārāyanām prabhūm | ko 'nyo hi bhuti Maitreya Mahābhārata-kṛid bhavet | Tena ryastā yathā Vedā matputreṇa mahātmanā | Drāpare hy atra Maitreya tad me śrīṇu yathārthataḥ | Brahmanā chodito Vyāso vedān ryastum prachakrame | Atha śishyān sa jugrāha chاتuro veda-pāragān | Rigveda-śācukam Pailām jagrāha sa mahāmuniḥ | Vaisampāyana-nāmānam Yajurredasya chāgrahit | Jaiminiṁ sāma-vedasya tathairātharraveda-rit | Sumanus tasya śishyo 'bhād Vedavyāsasya dhīmatāḥ | Romaharṣaṇa-nāmānam mahābuddhim mahāmunim | Sūtaṁ jagrāha śishyām sa itihāsa-purāṇayoḥ.* "The original Veda, four-footed [or in four quarters] consisted of a hundred thousand verses. From it arose the entire system of sacrifice, of ten descriptions [or of tenfold

¹⁴ For an account of the Manvantaras, see the First Part of this work, pp. 18, 19.

¹⁵ Lassen (Ind. Ant. i. 629, note) remarks:—"Vyasa signifies *arrangement*, and this signification had still retained its place in the recollection of the ancient recorders of the legend, who have formed from his name an irregular perfect, viz. *vivyāsa*." Lassen refers to two passages of the Mahābhārata in which the name is explained, viz. (i. 2417), *Vivyāsa redān yasmīn sa tasmād Vyāsa iti smṛitaḥ*. "He is called Vyasa because he divided the Veda." And (i. 4236) *Yo vyasya Vedānīś chaturas tapasā bhagavān rishiḥ | Loke vyāsatram āpede kārshṇyat krishnatram eva cha*. "The divine sage (Krishna Dvaipayana Vyasa) who, through intense devotion, divided the four Vedas, and so obtained in the world the title of Vyasa, and from his blackness, the name of Krishna."

efficacy?], and yielding all the objects of desire. Subsequently, in the twenty-eighth period, my son (it is Parāśara who is the speaker), the mighty Vyāsa divided into four parts the one four-quartered Veda. In the same way as the Vedas were divided by the wise Vyāsa, so had they been divided by all the [preceding] Vyāsas, including myself. And know that the sākhā divisions [formed] by him [were the same as those] formed in all the periods of four yugas. Learn, too, that Krishna Dvaipāyana Vyāsa was the lord Nārāyaṇa, for who else on earth could have composed the Mahābhārata? Hear now correctly how the Vedas were divided by him, my great-souled son, in this Dvāpara age. When, commanded by Brahmā, Vyāsa undertook to divide the Vedas, he took four disciples who had read through those books. The great muni took Paila as teacher of the Rik, Vaiśampāyana of the Yajush, and Jaimini of the Sāman, while Sumantu, skilled in the Atharvaveda, was also his disciple. He took, too, as his pupil for the Itihāsas and Puranas the great and intelligent muni, Sūta, called Romaharshana."

Vāyu Purana.—In the same way, and partly in the same words, the *Vāyu Purana* (Section ix.) represents the Vedas to have been divided in the Dvāpara age. It first describes how this was done by Manu in the *Svāyambhuva*, or first Manvantara, and then recounts how Vyāsa performed the same task in the existing seventh, or *Vaivasvata* Manvantara; and, no doubt, also in the Dvāpara age, though this is not expressly stated in regard to Vyāsa.

The following is an extract from this passage (as given in Dr. Aufrecht's Catalogue, p. 54):—*Drāpare tu purāvritte Manoh svāyambhure 'ntare | Brahmā Manum uvāchedam redam vyasya mahāmate | Parivṛittām yugaṁ tāta svalparīryā dvijātayah | saṁvrittā yugadoshena sarrañchaiva yathākramam | bhrashta-mānaṁ yāgavasād alpaśishtāṁ hi dṛiṣyate | Daśa-sāhasra-bhāgena hy avaśishṭam kṛitād idam | vīryaṁ tejo balañchālpaṁ sarrañchaiva pranuśyati | rede redā hi kāryyāḥ syur mā bhūd reda-vināśanam | rede nāśam anuprāpte yajño nāśaṁ gamishyati |*

*yajñe nashṭe deva-nāśas tataḥ sarram pranasyati | Ādyo vedaś
 chatushpādo śata-sāhasra-sammitaḥ | Punar dasa-guṇaḥ kṛitsno
 yajño vai sarra-kāma-dhuk | Eram uktas tathety uktrā Manur
 loka-hite rataḥ | redam ekam chatushpādaṁ chaturdhā ryubhajat
 prabhūḥ | Brahmaṇo rachanāt tāta lokānām hita-kāmyayā | tad
 aham varttamāna yushmākam veda-halpanam | manvantareṇa
 evayāmi ryatitānām prakalpanam | pratyaxena parorām rai tad
 nibodhata sattamāḥ | Asmin yuge kṛito Vyāsaḥ pārāśaryāḥ pa-
 rantapāḥ | Draipāyana iti khyāto Viṣṇor aṁśah prakīrtitaḥ |
 Brahmaṇā choditāḥ so 'smīn vedaṁ ryastum prachakrame | Atha
 śishyān sa jugrāha chatuṁ redakāraṇāt | Jaiminiñcha Suman-
 tuñcha Vaisampāyanam era cha | Pailām teshām chaturthantu
 pañchamaṁ Lomaharshaṇam.* “In the former Dvāpara of the Svāyambhuva Manvantara, Brahmā said to Manu, ‘Divide the Veda, O sage. The age is changed; through its baneful influence the Brahmans have become feeble, and from the same cause everything has been gradually corrupted, so that little [good] is seen remaining. Only a ten-thousandth part is now left of the vigour, fire, and energy of the Kṛita age, and everything declines. Vedas must be made out of the one Veda, lest the Veda be destroyed. The destruction of the Veda would involve the destruction of sacrifice; that again would occasion the annihilation of the gods, and then everything would go to ruin. The primeval Veda was four-footed [or consisted of four quarters], and extended to one hundred thousand verses, while sacrifice was of ten sorts [or tensfold efficacy], and yielded every object of desire.’ Being thus addressed, Manu, the lord, devoted to the good of the world, replied, ‘Be it so,’ and in conformity with the command of Brahmā, divided the one four-quartered Veda into four parts.¹⁶ I shall, therefore, narrate to you the division of the Veda in the existing Manvantara; from which present division you, virtuous sages, can understand those remote

¹⁶ The Maha Bhar. Santip. v. 13,678, says the Vedas were divided in the Svayambhuva Manvantara by Apāntaratamas, son of Sarasvatī. *Tena bhinnās tada veda manoh svāyambhuvo 'ntare.*

arrangements of the same kind which were made in past Manvantaras. In this Yuga, the victorious son of Parāśara, who is called Dvaipāyana, and is celebrated as a portion of Vishnu, has been made the Vyāsa. In this [Yuga ?], he, being commanded by Brahmā, began to divide the Vedas. For this purpose, he took four pupils, Jaimini, Sūnāntu, Vaiśampāyana, and Paila, and, as a fifth, Lomaharshana" [for the Puranas and Itihāsas, etc.]

Bhāgarata Purana.—It is in its Third Book, where the different Manvantaras are described, that the Vishnu Purana gives an account of the division of the Vedas. In the book of the Bhāgavata Purana, where the Manvantaras are enumerated, there is no corresponding allusion to the division of the Vedas. Towards the close of the Purana, however, in the sixth section of the twelfth book (verses 37 ff.) there is to be found what Prof. Wilson (Vish. Pur. Pref. p. xxvii.) calls "a rather awkwardly introduced description of the arrangement of the Vedas and Puranas by Vyāsa," which is no doubt brought in here, to supply the omission which the original author, or some subsequent editor, had discovered to exist in the earlier part of the work.

The passage (as given in the Bombay lithographed edition) is as follows :—*Sūta urācha | samāñitātmano brahmaṇaḥ parameshtīnāḥ | hṛid-ākāśād abhād nādor r̄ittirodhād ribhāryatē | yad-upāsanayā brahmaṇaḥ yogino malam ātmunāḥ | drarya-kriyā-kārakākhyām dhūtra yānty apanurbhāram | Tato 'bhūt trivid oṁkāro yo 'ryakta-prabhāraḥ srarāt | yat tallingam Bhagavato brahmaṇaḥ paramātmanāḥ | sriṇoti ya imaṁ sphoṭaṁ suptasrotre cha śūnyadīk | yena rāg ryajate yasya ryaktir ākāśe ātmunāḥ | sradhāmno brahmaṇaḥ sāxād rāchakaḥ paramātmanāḥ | sa-sarva-mantropanishad-reda-rījaṁ sanātanam | tasya hyāsaṁs trayo rārṇā a-kārādyā Bhṛigūdcaha | dhāryante yais trayo bhārā guṇā nāmārtha-r̄ittayaḥ | tato 'xara-samāmnāyam asrījad bhagavān ajāḥ | Antasthoshma-srāra-sparṣa-hrasva-dīrghādi-laxāṇam | tenāsau chāturo redāṁs chāturbhir vadanair vibhuḥ | sa-ryāhṛitiķān soñkārāmś chāturhotra-rivaxayā | putrān adhyā-*

*payat tāñstu brahmaśarin brahma-koridān | te tu dharmopadeshaṭārah śaputrebhyah samādiśan | te paramparayā prāptās tattachchhishyair dhrīta-rrataih | chaturyugeshv atha ryastā deāparādau maharshibhih | xīñāyushah xīñasattrān durmedhān rīrya kālatah | cedān brahmaśrayo ryasyan (sic) kṛidisthāch-yuta-noditāh | Asminn apy antare brahmaṇa bhayaśān loka-bhāvanah | brahmaśadyair lokapālair yāchito dharma-guptaye | Parāśarāt Satyaratyām aṁśāñśā-kalayā ribhuḥ | aratiñno mahābhāga vedaṁ chakre chaturcidham | ṛig-athāra-yajuḥ-sāmnām rāśin uddhṛitya rargaśah | chatasraḥ saṁhitās chakre mantrair manīgāñā icā | tāśām sa chaturaḥ śishyān upāhūya mahāmatiḥ | Ekaikām saṁhitām brahmaṇa ekaikasmī dādāu ribhuḥ | Pailāya saṁhitām ādyām bahričhākhyām urācha ha | Vaiśampāyanasañjñāya nigad ākhyām yajur-gāṇam | sāmnām Jaiminaye prāha tathā chhandoga-saṁhitām | Atharrāngirasiṁ nāma sra-śishāya Sumantare. “Sūta speaks: ‘From the sky of the supreme Brahma’s heart, when he was plunged in meditation, there issued a sound, which is perceived by the devout when they close their organs of sense. By adoring this sound, devotees destroy the soul’s threefold taint, extrinsic, inherent, and superhuman,¹⁷ and become exempt from future birth. From this sound sprang the triple *oṁkāra*, self-resplendent, unperceived in its production, the emblem of the divine Brahma, the supreme spirit. He (the supreme spirit) hears this sound (*sphoṭa*), though his ears be closed and his senses inactive,—(*this sphoṭa* or *oṁkāra*?) through which speech is revealed, and of which a manifestation is made in the firmament of the soul.¹⁸ This [*oṁkāra*] is the sensible*

¹⁷ *Dravya-kriyā-kāraka*, which the scholiast interprets as answering to *adhibhūta*, *adhyātmā*, and *adhidaitra*. See the explanation of these terms in Wilson’s *Sāṅkhya-kārikā*, pp. 2 and 9.

¹⁸ I quote the scholiast’s explanation of this obscure verse:—*Ko’sau paramātmā tam āha ‘srinoti’ iti | imam sphoṭam avyaktam oṁkāram | nanu jīva evo tām srinotu | na ity āha | supta-śrotre karna-pidhūnādinā arrīltike ‘pi śrotra sati | jīvastu karāṇādhīnatvād na tadā śrota | tadupalabdhisu tasya paramātmā-devākā eva iti bhāvah | Isvarostu naivam | yataḥ śūnya-drik śūnya ‘pi indriya-varge drik jñānām yasya | tathā hi supto yadā śabdaṁ śrutiṁ prabuddhyate na tadā jīvah śrotā linendriyatvāt | ato yas tadā śabdaṁ śrutiṁ jīram prabodhayati sa yathā paramātmā*

exponent of Brahma, the self-sustained, the supreme spirit; and it is the eternal seed of the Vedas, including all the Mantras and Upanishads. In this [*oṁkāra*] there were, o descendant of Bhrigu, three letters, A and the rest, by which the three conditions, viz. the [three] qualities, the [three] names, the [three] objects, the [three] states¹⁹ are maintained. From these three letters the divine and unborn being created the various letters of the alphabet, distinguished as inner (*y, r, l, v*), *ushmas* (*ś, sh, s, h*), vowels, long and short, and consonants. With this [alphabet] the omnipresent Being, desiring to reveal the functions of the four classes of priests, [created] from his four mouths the four Vedas with the three sacred syllables (*ryāhṛitis*) and the *oṁkāra*. These he taught to his sons, the brahmarshis, skilled in sacred lore; and these teachers of duty, in turn declared them to their sons. The Vedas were thus received by each succeeding generation of devout pupils throughout the four yugas, from their predecessors, and were divided by great sages at the beginning of the Dvāpara.²⁰ The Brahmarshis, impelled by Achyuta, who resided in their hearts, divided the Vedas, because they perceived that men had declined in age, in virtue, and in understanding. In this Manvantara also,²¹ the divine and omnipresent Being, the author of the

eva tadvat ko'sāv oṁkāras tām viśinashṭi sārlhena yena vīg brihatī ryajyate yasya cha hrīdayākūṣe ṛtmanah sakāśād vyaktir abhivyaktih. The word *sphoṭa* will be explained below, in Section VII.

¹⁹ These the scholiast explains thus:—*Gauṇīḥ sattvādayaḥ | nāmāni rig-yajuḥ-sūmāni | arthaḥ bhūr-bhuvāḥ-svar-lokāḥ | vrittayo jñigrud-ñayāḥ.*

²⁰ *Dvāparādau* can only mean the “beginning of the Dvāpara;” but the scholiast undertakes by the following process of reasoning to show that it means the end of that yuga. *Dvāparādām dvāparam īdir yasya tad-antyāñśa-laxayasya kīlasya | tasmin dvāparāntē reda-vibhāga-prasiddheḥ Śāntanu-samakālū- Vyāsāvatāra-prasiddheścha | vyastā vibhaktāḥ.* “*Dvāparādau* means the period of which the dvāpara was the beginning, i.e. the time distinguished as the concluding portion of that yuga; since it is notorious that the Vedas were divided at the end of the Dvāpara, and that the incarnation of Vyāsa was contemporaneous with Śāntanu. *Vyastāḥ=vibhaktāḥ*, divided.”

²¹ From this it appears that hitherto the account had not referred to the present Manvantara. The scholiast remarks:—*Evaṁ sūmānyato veda-vibhāga-kramam uktrān vaivasvata-manvantare viśeshato nirūpayitum āha.* “Having thus [in the pre-

universe, being supplicated by Brahmaśa and the other guardians of the world, to maintain righteousness, became partially incarnate as the son of Parāśara and Satyavatī, and divided the Veda into four parts. Selecting aggregates of Rik, Atharva, Yajush, and Sāma verses, and arranging them in sections (*rargas*), he formed four *sanhitās* (collections) of the hymns, as gems [of the same description are gathered together in separate heaps]. Having summoned four disciples, the sage gave to each of them one of these *sanhitās*. To Paila he declared the first *sanhitā*, called that of the Bahvṛichas; to Vaiśampāyana the assemblage of Yajush verses, called Nigada; to Jaimini the Chbandoga collection of Sāma verses; and to his pupil, Sumantu, the Atharvāngirasi."

The Bhāgavata Purana, however, is not consistent in the account which it gives of the division of the Vedas. In a passage already quoted in the First Part of this work, p. 48, it speaks of that division as having been the work of the monarch Purūravas, and as having taken place in the beginning of the Tretā age. From the importance of this text I will extract it here again at greater length.

The celestial nymph Ěrvāstī, the Purana tells us, had been doomed, in consequence of a curse, to take up her abode upon earth. She there fell in love with King Purūravas, the report of whose manly beauty had touched her heart, even before she had been banished from paradise. After spending many happy days in the society of her lover, she forsook him in consequence of his having infringed one of the conditions of their cohabitation, and Purūravas was in consequence rendered very miserable. He at length, however, obtained a renewal of their intercourse, and she finally recommended him to worship the Gandharvas, who would then re-unite her to him indissolubly.

The Purana then proceeds (ix. 14, 43 ff.) :—*Tasya saṃstu-*

ceding verses] generally described the manner in which the Vedas were divided, [the author] now states [as follows], with the view of determining particularly [what was done] in the Vaivasvata Manvantara."

vatas tushtā agnisthālin dadur nṛipa | Ěrraśim manyamānas
 tām so'budhyata charan ranc || Sthālin nyasya rane gatrā grīhān
 ādhyāyato niśi || Tretāyām samprarittāyām manasi trayy avartata ||
 Sthāli-sthānaṁ yato 'śratthaṁ śamī-garbhaṁ vilaxyu saḥ |
 Tena deo aranī kritrā Ěrraśi-loka-hāmyayā || Ěrraśim mantraṭo
 dhyāyan udharāraṇim uttarām | Ātmānam ubhayor mudhye yat
 tat projananaṁ prabhuḥ | Tasya nirmathānāj jāto jātaredā
 vibhāvasuh | Trayyā cha ridyuyā rājñā putratre kalpitās trirūpti |
 Tenāyajata yajñeśām bhagarantam adhoxajam | Ěrraśi-lokam
 anrichhan sarva-deoramayaṁ Harim | Eka era purā cedah prana-
 rah sareva-rāngmayah | Dero nārāyaṇo nānya eko 'gnir varṇa
 era cha | Purūravasa erāsi trayī tretā-mukhe nṛipa | Agniñā
 prajayā rājā lokām gāndharram eyirān. “The Gandharvas,
 gratified by his praises, gave him a platter containing fire. This
 he [at first] supposed to be Ěrvāśi, but became aware [of his
 mistake], as he wandered in the wood. Having placed the
 platter in the forest, Purūravas went home; and as he was
 meditating in the night, after the Tretā age had commenced,
 the triple Veda appeared before his mind.²² Returning to the
 spot where he had placed the platter, he beheld an *āśvattha* tree
 springing out of a *śamī* tree, and formed from it two pieces of
 wood. Longing to attain the world where Ěrvāśi dwelt, he
 imagined to himself, according to the sacred text, Ěrvāśi as the
 lower and himself as the upper piece of wood, and their offspring
 as lying between the two. Fire was generated from the friction,
 and, according to the threefold science [Veda], was under its
 triple form, recognised by the king as his son. With this seek-
 ing to attain the heaven of Ěrvāśi, he worshipped the divine
 Hari, the lord of sacrifice, Adhoxaja, formed of the substance of
 all the gods. There was formerly only one Veda, the sacred
 monosyllable *om*, the essence of all speech; only one god,
 Nārāyana; only one Agni, and [one] caste. From Purūravas
 came the triple Veda in the beginning of the Tretā age.

²² *Karma-bodhakam redatrayām prādurabhūt.* “The three Vedas, ordainers of
 rites, were manifested to him,” as the scholiast explains.

Through Agni, his son, the king attained the heaven of the Gandharvas.”²³

On the close of this passage the commentator remarks :—*Nanv anādir veda-traya-bodhito brāhmaṇyādīnām Indrādyaneka-devayajanena svarga-prāpti-hetuḥ karma-mārgaḥ kathaṁ sādir īra rāryate | Tatrāha ‘eka era’ iti drābhyaṁ | Purā kṛita-yuge saravāṅ-mayah sarrāsāṁ rāchām rīja-bhūtaḥ prāṇara eka era redaḥ | Deraścha Nārāyaṇa rka era | Agniścha eka era laukikah | Varṇaścha eka era haṁso nāma | Vedatrayī tu Purūravarasah sakāśād āśit . . . Ayam bhāvaḥ | kṛita-yuge sattra-pradhānāḥ prāyaśāḥ sarre’pi dhyāna-nishthāḥ | rajaḥ-pradhānac tu Tretā-yuge redādi-vibhāgena karmamārgāḥ prakaṭo babhūra ityarthah.* “How is it that the eternal method of works, which is pointed out by the three Vedas, and through which Brahmans and others, by worshipping Indra and many other gods, attain to paradise, is spoken of [in the preceding verses] as if it had a beginning in time? He [the author of the Purana] answers this in these two verses. Formerly, i.e. in the Kṛita age, there was only one Veda, the sacred monosyllable *om*, the essence of all words, i.e. that which is the seed of all words; and there was only one god, Nārāyaṇa; only one fire, that for common uses; and only one caste, the Hansa. But the triple Veda came from Purūravas. . . . The meaning is this: in the Kṛita age the quality of goodness predominated in men, who were almost all absorbed in meditation. But in the Tretā age, when passion (*rajas*) prevailed, the method of works was manifested by the division of the Vedas.”²⁴

This last quoted passage of the Bhāgavata gives, as I have inti-

²³ This story is also told in a prose passage in the Vish. Pur. iv. 6 (Wilson, p. 394). It is there stated that Purūravas divided fire, which was originally one, in a threefold manner. *Eko’gnir ādīv abhārad Ailona tu atra manvantare traītā pravartitū.* No mention, however, is there made of his having divided the Vedas, or partitioned society into castes.

²⁴ This legend is borrowed from the Sātapatha Brahmana, xi. 5, 1, 1 ff. (p. 855–858 Weber’s ed.), where the motive for its introduction is to describe the process by which fire was generated by Purūravas in obedience to the command of the Gandharvas, as the means of his admission into their paradise. See Professor Müller’s translation of this story in the Oxford Essays for 1856, pp. 62, 63. The legend is founded on the 95th hymn of the tenth book of the Rig-veda.

mated, a different account of the division of the Vedas from that contained in the text previously adduced from the same work, and in the citations from the Vishnu and Vāyu Purānas. The one set of passages speak of the Veda as having been divided by Vyāsa into four parts in the Dvāpara age; while the text last cited speaks of the triple Veda as having originated with Purūravas in the Tretā age; and evidently belonged to a different tradition from the former three. The legend which speaks of three Vedas is likely to be more ancient than that which speaks of four, as it was not till a comparatively late date that the Atharva asserted its right to be ranked with the three others as a fourth Veda. This earlier tradition, however, appears to have had its origin partly in etymological considerations. The word Tretā, though designating the *second* Yuga, means a triad, and seems to have been suggested to the writer's mind by the triple fire mentioned in the legend.

Mahābhārata.—The following passage from the *Mahābhārata*, Sāntiparva (verses 13,088 ff.), agrees partially in tenor with the second passage from the Bhāgavata, but is silent regarding Purūravas:—*Idam kṛitayugaṁ nāma kālāḥ śreshṭhaḥ prarartītah | Ahīmṣyā yajñapuśuḥ yuge 'smiṇ na tad anyathā || Chatushpāt śakulo dharmo bhacishyaty atra rai surāḥ | Tatās Tretā yugaṁ nāma trayī yatra bharishyati || Proxitā yajñapuśāro badhaṁ prāpsyanti vai makhe²⁵ | Yatra pādaś chaturtho rai dharmaṣya na bhavishyati || Tato rai deāparam nāma mīśraḥ kālo bharishyati.* “This present Krita age is the best of all the yugas; in it it is unlawful to slay any animals for sacrifice; in this age righteousness shall consist of all its four portions and be entire. Then shall follow the Tretā age, in which the triple

²⁵ Manu (i. 85, 86) differs from this passage of the *Mahābhārata* in making the Dvāpara the age of sacrifice;—*Anye kṛitayuge dharnūś Tretāyāṁ Dvāpare pare | Anye kāliyuge nrīnāṁ yuga-hrāśanurūpataḥ | Tapāḥ paraṁ Kṛitayuge Tretāyāṁ jñānam uchyate | Dvāpare yajñām evāhur dīnam ekaū kalau yuge.* “Different duties are practised by men in the Krita age, and different duties in the Tretā, Dvāpara, and Kali ages, in proportion to the decline in those yugas. Devotion is said to be supreme in the Krita, knowledge in the Tretā, sacrifice in the Dvāpara, and liberality alone in the Kali.”

Veda shall arise, and animals fit for sacrifice shall be slaughtered as oblations. In that age the fourth part of righteousness shall be wanting. Next shall succeed the Dvāpara, a mixed period."

The M. Bh. (Śāntip. 13,475) relates that two Asuras, who beheld Brahmā creating the Vedas, suddenly snatched them up and ran off. Brahmā laments their loss, exclaiming, *Vedo me paramāñ charur redo me paramam balam | . . . Vedān rite hi kiñ kuryāñ lokānāñ srishtim uttamām.* "The Veda is my principal eye; the Veda is my principal strength. . . . What shall I do without the Vedas, the most excellent creation in the universe?" They were, however, recovered and restored to Brahmā (v. 13,506 ff.)

Vishnu-purāna.—The following verse, Vish. Pur. iii. 2, 12 (Wilson, p. 269), refers to the periodical disappearance of the Vedas:—*Chaturyugānte vedānāñ jāyate kuliriplacah | prarartayanti tān etya bhuri saptarshayo dirah.* "At the end of the four ages (*yugas*) the disappearance of the Vedas, incident to the kali, takes place. The seven rishis come from heaven to earth, and again give them currency." (Compare M. Bh. Śāntip. 7,660, which will be quoted further on.)

SECT. V.—*Accounts in the Vishnu and Vāyu Puranas of the schisms between the adherents of the Yajur-veda, Vaisampāyana and Yājñavalkya; hostility of the Ātharvayas towards the other Vedas; and of the Chhandogas towards the Rig-veda.*

The Vishnu Purana, iii. 5, 2 ff. (Wilson, p. 279 ff.), gives the following legend regarding the way in which the Yajur-veda came to be divided into two schools, the black and the white:—*Yājñavalkyas tu tasyābhūd Brahmarātāsuto drīja | Śishyah parama-dharmajño guru-vṛitti-parah sadā | Rishir yo 'dyā mahāmerūm samāje nāgamishyatī | Tasya rai sapta-rātrantu brahma-hatyā bharishyati | Pūrvam eva muni-ganaih samayo 'bhūt kṛito drīja | Vaisampāyana ekas tu tam vyatikrāntarāmś tadā | Srasrīyam bālakām so 'tha padā śprishtam aghātayat |*

Śishyān āha sa bhoḥ śishyā brahma-hatyāpahaṁ vratam | Charadvam mathrite saree na richāryyam idam tuthā | Athāha Yajñavalkyas tañ kim ebhir bhagacun deijaiḥ | Kleśitair alpatējobhir charishye 'ham idam vratam | Tutaḥ kruddho guruk prāha Yajñaralkyam mahāmatih | Muchyatām yut trayā 'dhītam matto riprāramanyaka | Nistejaso radasy etān yas tam brāhmaṇa-pungarān | Tena śishyena nārtho 'sti munājñā--bhāṅgākariṇā | Yajñaralkyas tataḥ prāha bhaktau tat te mayoditam | Mamāpy alaṁ trayā 'dhītam yud mayā tul idaṁ drija | Ity uktrā rudhirāktāni sarāpāṇi yajñāṁshī sah | Chhardayitrā dadau tasmui yayau cha seechhayā munih | yajñāṁshy alha risipishtāni yajñaralkyena eai dcija | Jagrihus tittiribhūtrā Taittiriyās tu te tataḥ | Brahma-hatyā-vratam chīrṇam gurunā choditais tu yaiḥ | Charakādhwaryaras te tu charanād munisattamāḥ | Yajñaralkyo 'tha Maitreya prāṇāyāma-parāyanah | tushṭāra prayataḥ sūryam yajñāṁshy abhilashaṁs tatzīḥ | . . . Ity evamādibhistena stūyamanah staraiḥ raviḥ | rājū-rūpa-dharaiḥ prāha rṛiyatām iti vāñchhitam | Yajñaralkyas tailā prāha pranipatya dirākaram | yajñāṁshī tāni me dehi yāni santi na me gurau | Eram ukto dadau tasmai yajñāṁshī bhagarān raviḥ | ayātayāma-sañjñāni yāni retti na tailguruḥ | Yajñāṁshī yair adhītāni tāni vīprair devijottama | rājinās te samākhyātāḥ sūryo 'ścaḥ so 'bharad yataḥ.

"Yajnavalkya, son of Brahmarāti, was his [Vaiśampāyana's] disciple, eminently versed in duty, and obedient to his teacher. An agreement had formerly been made by the Munis that any one of their number who should fail to attend at an assembly on Mount Meru on a certain day should incur the guilt of Brahmanicide during [within?] a period of seven nights. Vaiśampāyana was the only person who infringed this agreement, and he in consequence occasioned the death of his sister's child by touching it with his foot. He then desired all his disciples to perform in his behalf an expiation which should take away his guilt, and forbade any hesitation. Yajnavalkya then said to him, 'Reverend sir, what is the necessity for these faint and feeble Brahmins? I will perform the expiation.' The wise teacher,

incensed, replied to Yajnavalkya, ‘Contemner of Brahmans, give up all that thou hast learnt from me; I have no need of a disobedient disciple, who, like thee, stigmatizes these eminent Brahmans as feeble.’ Yajnavalkya rejoined, ‘It was from devotion [to thee] that I said what I did; but I, too, have done with thee: here is all that I have learnt from thee.’ Having spoken, he vomited forth the identical Yajush texts tainted with blood, and giving them to his master, he departed at his will. [The other pupils] having then become transformed into partridges (*tittiri*), picked up the Yajush texts, and were thence called Taittiriyas. And those who had by their teacher’s command performed the expiation, were from this performance (*charana*) called Charakadhvaryus. Yajnavalkya then, who was habituated to the exercise of suppressing his breath, devoutly hymned the sun, desiring to obtain Yajush texts . . . [I pass over the hymn.] Thus celebrated with these and other praises, the sun assumed the form of a horse, and said, ‘Ask whatever boon thou desirest.’ Yajnavalkya then, prostrating himself before the lord of day, replied, ‘Give me such Yajush texts as my teacher does not possess.’ Thus supplicated, the sun gave him the Yajush texts called *Ayātayāma*, which were not known to his master. Those by whom these texts were studied were called Vājins, because the sun (when he gave them) assumed the shape of a horse (*vāji*).’

I quote also the parallel text from the Vayu Purana, as it exhibits some slight variations from the preceding, (Vayu Pur. Aufr. Cat. p. 55):—*Kāryam āśid ṛshīnāñcha kiñcid brāhmaṇa-sattamāḥ | Meru-priṣṭhaṁ samāśādya tais tadā 'striti mantritam | Yo no 'tra sapta-rātrena nāgachched drija-sattamāḥ | sa kuryād brahma-badhyāñ rai samayo naḥ prakīrtitāḥ | Tatas te saganāḥ sarre Vaiśampāyana-varjitāḥ | Prayayuh saptarātrena yatra sandhiḥ krito 'bharat | Brāhmaṇānāntu vachanād brahma-badhyāñ chakāra sah | Śishyān atha samāñya sa Vaiśampāyano 'brarit | Brahma-badhyāñ charadhvām vai matkṛite drijah-sattamāḥ | sarre yūyaṁ samāgamyā brūta me taddhitam*

vachah | Yājñavalkya uvācha | Aham era charishyāmi tishthantu
 munayas tv imē | balañchotthāpayishyāmi tapasā svēna bhāvitah |
 Evam uktas tatah kruddho Yājñaralkyam athābravīt | uvācha
 yat trayā 'dhītañ sārcam prutyarpayasra me | Ecum uktah
 sarūpāni yajūñshī pradadau guroh | ruddhīreṇa tathā 'kiñā
 chharditvā brahma-vittamah | Tatah sa dhyānam āsthāya sūryam
 ārādhayad deijah | sūrya brahma yad uchchhinnam khañ gatrā
 pratitishthati | Tato yāni gatāny ūrdhvañ yajūñshy āditya-mañ-
 dalam | Tāni tasmāi dadau tuṣṭah sūryo vai Brāhma-rātaye |
 Aśvarūpaścha mārttando Yājñaralkyāya dhimate | Yajūñshy adh-
 iyate yāni brahmañā yena kenachit | aśrārūpāni dattāni tatas
 te Vajino 'bharan | brahma-hatyā tu yaiś chīrñā charaṇāt cha-
 rakāh smṛitāh | Vaiśampāyana-śishyās te charakāh samudāh-
 ritāh. “The rishis having a certain occasion, met on the summit
 of Mount Meru, when, after consultation, they resolved and
 agreed together that any one of their number who should fail to
 attend there for seven nights should be involved in the guilt of
 brahmanicide. They all in consequence resorted to the appointed
 place for seven nights along with their attendants. Vaiśampā-
 yana alone was absent, and he, according to the word of the
 Brahmans, committed brahmanicide. He then assembled his
 disciples, and desired them to perform, on his behalf, an expia-
 tion for his offence, and to meet and tell him what was salutary
 for the purpose. Yājnavalkya then said, ‘I myself will perform
 the penance; let all these munis refrain: inspired by my own
 devotion, I shall raise up strength.’ Incensed at this speech of
 Yājnavalkya [Vaiśampāyana] said to him, ‘Restore all that thou
 hast learned.’ Thus addressed, the sage, deeply versed in sacred
 lore, vomited forth the identical Yajush texts stained with blood,
 and delivered them to his teacher. Plunged in meditation, the
 Brahman then adored the sun, saying, ‘Sun, every sacred text
 which disappears [from the earth] goes to the sky, and there
 abides.’ The sun, gratified, and [appearing] in the form of a
 horse, bestowed on Yājnavalkya, son of Brahma-rāta, all the
 Yajush texts which had ascended to the solar region. All the

Yajush texts which are [?] studied by any priest, were given in the form of horses, [?] and in consequence these priests became Vajins. And the disciples of Vaiśampāyana, by whom the expiatory rite was accomplished, were called *Charakas*, from its accomplishment (*charana*)."²⁶

It is sufficiently evident from the preceding legend that the adherents of the two different divisions of the Yajurveda (the Taittiriya or black, and the Vajasaneyi or white), must in ancient times have regarded each other with feelings of the greatest hostility—feelings akin to those with which the followers of the rival deities, Vishnu and Śiva, look upon each other in modern days. On this subject I quote an extract from Professor Weber's "History of Indian Literature."

P. 84.—"Whilst the theologians of the Rik are called Bahvrichas, and those of the Sāman Chhandogas, the old name for the divines of the Yajush is Adhvaryu; and these old appellations are to be found in the Sanhitā of the Black Yajush (the Taittiriya), and in the Brahmana of the White Yajush (the Śata-patha Brahmana). The latter work applies the term Adhvaryus to its own adherents, whilst their opponents are denominated Charakādhvaryus, and are the objects of censure. This hostility is also exhibited in a passage of the Sanhitā of the White Yajush, where the Charakāchārya, as one of the human sacrifices to be offered at the Purushamedha, is devoted to Dushkrita or Sin."²⁷

²⁶ In a note to p. 461 of his Translation of the Vishnu Purana, Professor Wilson mentions the following legend illustrative of the effects of this schism. "The Vāyu and Matsya relate, rather obscurely, a dispute between Janamejaya and Vaiśampāyana, in consequence of the former's patronage of the Brahmans of the Vajasaneyi branch of the Yajur-veda, in opposition to the latter, who was the author of the Black or original Yajush. Janamejaya twice performed the Aśvamedha according to the Vajasaveyi ritual, and established the Trisarvī, or use of certain texts by Āśmaka and others, by the Brahmans of Anga, and by those of the middle country. He perished, however, in consequence, being cursed by Vaiśampāyana. Before their disagreement, Vaiśampāyana related the Mahābhārata to Janamejaya."

²⁷ Vajasaneyi Sanhitā xxx. 18 (p. 846 of Weber's ed.) :—*Dushkrītāya charakā-chāryyam | (charakānām gurum—Scholiast).* Prof. Müller also says (Anc. Sans. Lit. p. 350), "This name Charaka is used in one of the *Khilas*" (the passage just quoted) "of the Vajasaneyi Sanhitā as a term of reproach. In the 30th *Adhyāya* a list of people is given who are to be sacrificed at the Purushamedha, and among them we

In his *Indische Studien* (iii. 454) Prof. Weber specifies the following passages in the *Satapatha Brahmana* as those in which the Charakas, or *Charakādhwaryus* are censured, viz., iii. 8, 2, 24; iv. 1, 2, 19; iv. 2, 3, 15; iv. 2, 4, 1; vi. 2, 2, 1, 10; viii. 1, 3, 7; viii. 7, 1, 14, 24. Of these I quote one specimen (iv. 1, 2, 19):—*Tā u ha Charakā nānaiva mantrābhyaṁ juhmati prāṇodānau kurma iti radantah | Tad u tathā na kuryāt | mohayanti ha te yajamānasya prāṇodānāv apīdvā enām tūshṇīm juhuyāt.* “These the Charakas offer respectively with two mantras, saying thus: ‘These are his two breathings,’ and ‘we thus make these two breathings endowed with their respective powers.’ But let no one adopt this procedure, for they confound the breathings of the worshipper. Wherefore let this libation be offered in silence.”²⁸

But these sectarian jealousies were not confined to the different schools of the *Yajur-veda*; the adherents of the *Atharva-veda* seem to have evinced a similar spirit of hostility towards the followers of the other Vedas. On this subject Prof. Weber remarks as follows in his *Indische Studien*, i. 296. “A good deal of animosity is generally displayed in most of the writings connected with the Atharvan towards the other three Vedas; but the strongest expression is given to this feeling in the first of the Atharva *Parīśishtas*, chapter xxii.”

He then proceeds to quote the following passage from that work and chapter:—*Bahrrīcho hanti rai rāshṭram adhvaryur nāśayet sutān | Chhando go dhanāñ nāśayet tasmād Ātharrāgo guruḥ | Ajñānād rā pramādād rā yasya syād bahrrīcho guruḥ | desā-rāshṭra-purāmātya-nāśas tasya na saṃśayah | yadi vā*

find the *Charakāchārya* as the proper victim to be offered to Dushkrita or Sin. This passage, together with similar hostile expressions in the *Satapatha Brahmana*, were evidently dictated by a feeling of animosity against the ancient schools of the *Adhvaryus*, whose sacred texts we possess in the *Taittirīya-veda*, and from whom *Yājnavalkya* seceded in order to become himself the founder of the new *Charanas* of the *Vājasaneyins*.²⁹

²⁸ Though aided by a learned friend in rendering this passage, I am not certain of the perfect exactness of the translation. But there is no doubt whatever that the tendency of the text is hostile to the rival school of the Charakas.

*'dhvarya-varām rājā niyunakti purohitum | śastrena badhyate
 xi-pram parixīñārtha-vāhanāḥ | yathaica pangur adhvēnam apaxī
 chānda-bhojanam | evām chhandoga-guruṇā rājā vṛiddhiṁ na
 gachhati | purodha jalado yasya maudo vā syāt kathañchana |
 abdād dasabhyo māsebhyo rāshtra-bhrañśām sa gachhati.* “A Balvīcha (Rig-veda priest) will destroy a kingdom; an Adhvaryu (Yajur-veda priest) will destroy offspring; and a Chhandoga (Sūna-veda priest) will destroy wealth;—hence an Atharvana priest is the [proper] spiritual adviser. Destruction of country, kingdom, cities, and ministers is certainly incurred by the [king] who, through ignorance or folly, takes a Balvīcha priest for his guide. Or if a king appoints an Adhvaryu priest to be his domestic chaplain, he loses his wealth and his chariots, and is speedily slain by the sword. As a lame man [makes no progress] on a road, and a creature which is not a bird [cannot] eat eggs [?], so no king prospers who has a Chhandoga for his teacher. He who has a *Jalada* or a *Mauda* for his priest, loses his kingdom after a year or ten months.”

“Thus,” continues Prof. Weber, “the author of the Pariśishta attacks certain sākhās of the Atharva-veda itself, for such are the Jaladas and the Mandas, and admits only a Bhārgava, a Paippalāda, or a Śaunaka to be a properly qualified teacher. He further declares that the Atharva-veda is intended only for the highest order of priest, the brahman, not for the three other inferior sorts.”

The following passage is then quoted:—*Atharrā srijate ghoram
 adbhuṭān śamayet tathā | atharrā raxate yañnam yañnasya patir
 Angirāḥ | Diryāntarixa-bhaumānām utpātānām unckadhbā |
 śamayita brahma-reda-jñas tāsmād daxīñato Bhṛiguḥ | Brahmā
 śamayed nādhvaryur na chhandogo na bherichah | raxāñsi
 raxati brahmā brahmā tasmād atharra-rit.* “The Atharva priest creates horrors, and he also allays alarming occurrences; he protects the sacrifice, of which Angiras is the lord. He who is skilled in the Brahma-veda (the Atharva) can allay manifold portents, celestial, atmospheric, and terrestrial, wherefore the

Bhrigu [is to be placed] on the right hand. It is the brahman, and not the adhvaryu, the chhandoga, or the bahvricha, who can allay [portents]; the brahman wards off [?] raxases, wherefore the brahman is he who knows the Atharva."

I subjoin another extract from Prof. Weber's *Indische Studien*, i. 63 ff., partly to complete what was said on the relation of the Sāma-veda to the Rig-veda in Part Second of this work, pp. 202, 203, and partly to illustrate the mutual hostility of the different schools. "To understand the relation of the Sāma-veda to the Rig-veda, we have only to form to ourselves a clear and distinct idea of the manner in which these hymns in general arose, how they were then carried to a distance by those tribes which emigrated onward, and how they were by them regarded as sacred, whilst in their original home, they were either—as living in the immediate consciousness of the people—subjected to modifications corresponding to the lapse of time, or made way for new hymns by which they were pushed aside, and so became forgotten. It is a foreign country which first surrounds familiar things with a sacred charm; emigrants continue to occupy their ancient mental position, preserving what is old with painful exactness, while at home life opens out for itself new paths. New emigrants follow those who had first left their home, and unite with those who are already settlers in a new country. And now the old and the new hymns and usages are fused into one mass, and are faithfully, but uncritically, learned and imbibed by travelling pupils from different masters (several stories in the Vrihad Aranyaka are especially instructive on this point, see Ind. Stud. p. 83), so that a varied intermixture arises. Others, again, more learned, then strive to introduce arrangement, to bring together what is homogeneous, to separate what is distinct; and in this way theological intolerance springs up; without which the rigid formation of a text or a canon is impossible. The influence of courts on this process is not to be overlooked; as, for example, in the case of Janaka, King of Videha, who in Yājnavalkya had found his Homer. Anything approaching to a

clear insight into the reciprocal relations of the different schools will in vain be sought either from the Puranas or the Charanavyūha, and can only be attained by comparing the teachers named in the different Brahmanas and Sūtras, partly with each other and partly with the text of Panini and the gaṇapāṭha and commentary connected therewith (for the correction of which a thorough examination of Patanjali would offer the only sufficient guarantee). For the rest, the relation between the S. V. and the R. V. is in a certain degree analogous to that between the White and the Black Yajush ; and, as in the Brahmana of the former (the Śatapatha Br.) we often find those teachers who are the representatives of the latter, mentioned with contempt, it cannot surprise us, if in the Brahmana of the Sāma-veda, the Paingins and Kaushītakins are similarly treated."

It will have become sufficiently manifest to the reader of the preceding passages which I have extracted from the Puranas concerning the division and different Śākhās of the Vedas, that the traditions which they embody contain very little real information in regard to the composition of the hymns, or the manner in which they were preserved, collected, or arranged. In fact, I have not adduced these passages for the purpose of elucidating those points, but to show the legendary character of the narratives, and their discrepancies in matters of detail. For an account of the Śākhās of the Vedas, the ancient schools of the Brahmans, and other matters of a similar nature, I must refer to the excellent work of Prof. Müller, the "History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature," pp. 119-132 and 364-388 and elsewhere.

SECT VI.—Reasonings of the Commentators on the Vedas, in support of the authority of the Vedas.

I proceed now to adduce some extracts from the works of the more systematic authors who have treated of the origin and authority of the Vedas, I mean the commentators on these books themselves, and the authors and expositors of the aphorisms of

several of the schools of Hindu philosophy. Whatever we may think of the premises from which these writers set out, or of the conclusions at which they arrive, we cannot fail to be struck with the contrast which their speculations exhibit to the loose and mystical ideas of the Puranas and Upanishads, or to admire the acuteness of their reasoning, and the logical precision with which their arguments are presented.

1.—The first passage which I shall adduce is from Sāyana's introduction to his commentary on the Rig-veda, the Vedārtha-prakāśa, pp. 3 ff. (Sāyana, as we have seen in Part Second, p. 172, lived in the 14th century, A.D.) *Nanu Veda eva tārad nāsti | kutas tadāntara-viśeṣha ṛigredaḥ | Tathā hi | ko 'yaṁ redo nāma | na hi tatra laxaṇam̄ pramāṇam̄ vā 'sti | nacha tad-ubhaya-ryatirekeṇa kiñcid castu prasidhyati | Laxaṇa-pramāṇa-bhyām̄ hi rastu-siddhir iti myāyāridām matam | Pratyaxānumānāgameśhu pramāṇa-viśeṣeshu antimo Veda iti talla-xaṇam iti chet | na | Mantrādi-smṛitishu aliryāpteh | Samaya-balena sam-yak paroxānnubhara-sādhanam ity etasya āgama-laxaṇasya tās-vapi sadbhārāt | apaurushayatre sati iti riśeṣhaṇād adosha iti chet | na | Vedasyāpi paramēśvara-nirmitatrena paurushayatrāt | Śarīra-dhāri-jīra-nirmitatvābhārāt apaurushayatram iti chet | [na?] | ‘Sahasra-śirshā purusha’ ityādi-śrutibhir iśvarasyāpi śarīritrāt | Karma-phala-rūpa-śarīra-dhāri-jīra-nirmitatrābhāra-mātreṇa apaurushayatram ricaxitam iti chet | na | Jīra-viśeṣhair Agni-Vāye-Ādityair redānām utpāditatrāt | ‘Rigreda erāgnēr ajāyata Yajurcedo rāyoh Sāmareda ādityād’ iti śruter iśvara-sya agnyādi-prerakatrena nirmāṭyitrām̄ drashṭaryam | mantra-brāhmaṇātmakaḥ śabda-rāśir veda iti chet | na | Īdriśo mantrah | īdriśam brāhmaṇam ity anayor adyāpi aniriyitatrāt | Tasmād nāsti kiñcid redasya laxaṇam | Nāpi tat-sadbhārc̄ pramāṇam̄ paśyāmah | ‘Rigredam bhagavo ’dhyemi Yajurvedam̄ Sāmaredam Ātharrāṇam̄ chaturtham’ ityādi rākyam̄ pramāṇam̄ iti chet | na | tasyāpi rākyasya redāntah-pātitrena ātmāśrayatrea-prasāṇ-gāt | Na khalu nipiṇo ’pi sraskandham̄ āroḍhūm̄ prabhared iti | ‘Veda eva drījātīnām̄ niḥśreyasa-karab̄ paraḥ’ iti ādi smṛiti-*

*vākyam pramāṇam iti chet | na | tasyāpy ukta-śruti-mūlatrena
mīrākṛitatvāt | pratyaxādikam śāṅkitum apy ayogyaṁ | Veda-
vishayā loka-prasiddhiḥ sārajaninā 'pi nūlaṁ nabha ityādīva
bhrāntā | Tasmāl luxaṇa-pramāṇa-rahitasya redasya sadbhāvo na
anīgkartuṁ śakyate iti pūrrapuṣṭaḥ |*

*Atra uchyate | mantra-brāhmaṇātmakam tāvad adushtam
laxaṇam | ata eva Āpastambo yajña-paribhāshāyām evāha
'mantra-brāhmaṇayor veda-nāmadhēcyam' iti | tuyostu rūpam
uparishṭhād nīrñeshyate | apaurushcya-cākyatram iti idam api
yādrīśam asmābhīr viraritam tādriśam uttaratra spashṭi-bhari-
shyati | pramāṇāny api yathoktāni śruti-smṛiti-lokaprasiddhi-
rūpāni reda-sadbhāre drashtaryāni | Yathā ghaṭa-paṭādi-dravy-
ānām sra-prakāśatrābhāre 'pi sāryachandrādinām sra-prakā-
śatram arirudham tathā manushyādīnām scuskandhārohāsam-
bhare 'py akūṇthita-śakter redasya itara-eastu-pratipādakatrat-
rat sra-pratipādakatcam apy astu | Ata eca sampradāya-vido
'kuṇṭhitām śaktim redasya darsayanti 'chodanā ni bhūtam bha-
vishyantum sūrmām vyaralitam riprakṛishtam ity evāñjātīyam
artham śaknoty arayamayitum' iti | Tathā sati veda-mūlāyāḥ
smṛites tadubhaya-mūlāyā loka-prasiddheścha prāmāṇyam dūr-
vāram | Tasmāl lalexaṇa-pramāṇa-siddho vedo na kenāpi chārvā-
kādinā 'podhūm śakyate iti sthitam ||*

*Nanv astu nāma Vedākhyuḥ kāśchit padārthaḥ | tathāpi
nāsu ryākhyānam arhati apramāṇatvena anupayuktateat | Na
hi Vedāḥ pramāṇam tallaxaṇasya tatra duḥsampādatrāt | tathā
hi 'samyaग् anubhara-sādhanam pramāṇam' iti kechil laxaṇam
āhuḥ | āpare tu 'anudhigatārtha-gantṛi pramāṇam' ity āchax-
ate | na chaitad ubhayam rede sambharati | mantra-brāhmaṇāt-
mako hi redaḥ | tatra mantrāḥ kechid abodhakāḥ | 'amyak sā ta
Indra riṣhṭir' ityeko mantrāḥ | 'Yādrīśmin dhāyi tam ayasya-
yā ridad' ity anyaḥ | 'Śrīṇyeca jarbhāri turpharītā' ityaparaḥ |
'Āpānta-manyus triphala-prabharmā' ityādaya udāhāryāḥ | na
hy etair mantraiḥ kāśchid apy artho 'cabudhyate | eteshv anu-
bhāro era yadā nāsti tada tatsamyaktrām tadiya-sādhanatrančha
dūrāpetam | 'Adhāḥ scid āśid upari scid āśid' iti mantrasya*

*bodhakatre 'pi 'sthāñur rā purusho vā' ityādi-vākyā-vat sandig-
dhārtha-bodhakatrād nāsti prāmāṇyam | 'Oshadhe trāyastainam'
iti mantra darbha-vishayaḥ | 'Sealwhite mainaṁ hiṁsir' iti xura-
vishayāḥ | 'Śrinota grārāṇa' iti pāshāṇa-vishayaḥ | Eteshv
achetanānāṁ darbha-xura-pāshāṇānāṁ chetana-vat sambodha-
naṁ śrūyate | tato 'drau chandramasāv' iti vākyā-vad riparītār-
tha-bodhakatrād aprāmāṇyam | 'Eka era Rudro na dvitīyo
'vatasthe' | 'sahasrāṇi sahasraśo ye Rudrā adhi bhāmyām'
ity anayos tu mantrayor 'yārajjivam aham maunī' iti vākyavād
vyāghāta-bodhakatrād aprāmāṇyam | 'Āpa undantu' iti mantra
yajamānasya xaura-kāle jalena śiraśaḥ kledanam brūte | 'Śubhike
śira aroha śobhayantī mukham mama' iti mantrorivāha-kāle maṇ-
galācharaṇārtham pushpa-nirmitāya śubhikāyā varabhadwoh
śirasy avasthānam brūte | tayoścha mantrayor loka-prasiddhār-
thānurādītvād anadhigatārtha-gantrītvām nāsti | tasmād man-
tra-bhāgo na pramāṇam |*

*Atra uchyate | Amyagādi-mantrāṇām artho Yāskena nirukta-
granthe 'cabodhitaḥ | tat-parichaya-rahitānām anavabodho na
mantrānām doshām ārahati | Ata evātra loka-nyāyam udāha-
ranti 'naisha sthāñor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati |
purushāparādho sambharati' iti | 'Adhah srid āśid' iti man-
trāścha na sandeha-prabodhanāya prarūptāḥ kiṁtarhī jyoti-
kāranāsyā paravastuno 'igambhiratvām niśchetum era prarūpt-
tāḥ | tadarthatam era hi gurusāstra-sampradāya-rahitair dur-
bodhyatvam 'adhah srid' ity anayā vacho-bhāṣyā upanyasyati |
Sa evābhiprāya uparitaneśha 'ko addhā veda' ity ādi-mantreshu
spashṭī-kṛitah | 'Oshadhy' ādi mantreshu api chetanā era tattad-
abhimāni-devatās tena tena nāmnā sambodhyante | tāścha devatā
bhagavatā Bādarāyaṇena 'abhimāni-ryapadcsastu' iti sūtre sū-
trītāḥ | Ekasyāpi Rudrasya sva-mahimnā sahasra-mūrtti-svī-
kārād nāsti paraspāram vyāghātāḥ | Jalādi-dravyena śiraḥ-kle-
danāder loka-siddhatve 'pi tad-abhimāni-devatānugrahasya apra-
siddhatvāt tadvishayatrena ajñātārtha-jñāpakatvam | tato lax-
āṇa-sadbhārād asti mantra-bhāgasya pramāṇyam.*

"But, some will say, there is no such thing as a Veda;

how, then, can there be a Rig-veda, forming a particular part of it? For what is this Veda? It has no characteristic sign or evidence; and without these two conditions, nothing can be proved to exist. For logicians hold that ‘a thing is established by characteristic signs and by proof.’ If you answer that ‘of the three kinds of proof, *perception*, *inference*, and *scripture*, the Veda is the last, and that this is its sign;’ then the objectors rejoin that this is not true, for this sign extends too far, and includes also *Manu* and the other *Smritis*; since there exists in them also this characteristic of Scripture, viz., that ‘in virtue of common consent it is a perfect instrument for the discovery of what is invisible.’ If you proceed, ‘the Veda is faultless, in consequence of its characteristic that it has no person (*purusha*) for its author;’ they again reply, ‘Not so; for as the Veda was formed by Paramesvara (God), it had a person (*purusha*) for its author.’ If you rejoin, ‘It had no person (*purusha*) for its author, for it was not made by any embodied living being;’ [they refuse²⁹ to admit this] on the ground that, according to such Vedic texts as ‘Purusha has a thousand heads,’ it is clear that Isvara (God) also has a body. If you urge that *apaurusheyatra* (‘the having had no personal author’) means that it was not composed by a living being endowed with a body which was the result of works; —the opponent denies this also, and asserts that the Vedas were created by particular living beings,—Fire, Air, and the Sun; for from the text ‘the Rig-veda sprang from fire, the Yajur-veda from air, and the Sama-veda from the sun,’ etc., it will be seen that Isvara, by inciting fire and the others, was the maker. If you next say that the Veda is a collection of words in the form of Mantras and Brahmanas, the objectors rejoin, ‘Not so, for it has never yet been defined that a Mantra is so and so, and a Brahmana so and so.’ There exists, therefore, no *characteristic mark*

²⁹ I have translated this, as if there had been (which there is not) a negative particle *na* in the text, after the *iti chet*, as this seems to me to make the best sense. I understand from Prof. Müller that the negative particle is found in some of the MSS.

of a Veda. Nor do we see any *proof* that a Veda exists. If you say that the text, 'I peruse, reverend sir, the Rig-veda, the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, and the Atharva as the fourth,' is a proof, the antagonist answers, 'No, for as that text is part of the Veda, it is exposed to the objection of depending upon itself; for no one, be he ever so clever, can mount upon his own shoulders.' If you again urge that such texts of the Smṛiti as this, 'It is the Veda alone which is supreme, and the source of blessedness to twice-born men,' are proofs, the objector rejoins, 'Not so; since these too must be rejected, as being founded on the same Veda.' The evidence of the senses and other ordinary sources of knowledge ought not even to be doubted. And common report in reference to the Veda, though universal, is erroneous, like such phrases as 'the blue sky,' etc. Wherefore, as the Veda is destitute of characteristic sign and proof, its existence cannot be admitted. Such is the first side of the question.

"To this we reply :—The definition of the Veda, as a work composed of Mantra and Brahmana, is unobjectionable. Hence Āpastamba says in the Yajnaparibhāshā, *the name of Mantra and Brahmana is Veda*. The nature of these two things will be settled hereafter.³⁰ The sense we attach to the expression '*without any personal author*' will also be declared further on. Let the proofs which have been specified of the existence of the Veda, viz., the Veda (itself), the Smṛiti, and common notoriety, be duly weighed. Although jars, cloth, and other such [dark] objects have no inherent property of making themselves visible, it is no absurdity to speak of the sun, moon, and other luminous bodies, as shining by their own light. Just in the same way (though it is impossible for beings like men to mount on their own shoulders) let the all-penetrating Veda be held to have the power of proving

³⁰ See Part Second, p. 172. Madhava Achārya, the author of the Vedārtha-prakāśa on the Taittiriya Sanhitā, admits the priority of the Mantras or hymns to the Brahmanas in these words (p. 9):—*Yadyapi mantra-brāhmaṇātmako Vedas tathāpi brāhmaṇasya mantra-ryākhyāna-rūpatvāt mantrā evādau samāmnātūḥ*. "Though the Veda consists of Mantras and Brahmanas, yet as the Brahmanas are expository of the Mantras, the latter were first recorded."

itself as it has of proving other things.³¹ Hence traditionists set forth this penetrating force of the Veda ; thus, ‘the Scripture is able to make known the past, the future, the minute, the near, the remote.’ Such being the case, the authority of the Smṛiti, which is based on the Veda, and of common notoriety, which is based on both, is irresistible. Wherefore it stands fast that the Veda, which is established by characteristic sign, and by proof, cannot be refuted by Chārvākas or any other opponents.

“ But let it be admitted that there is a thing called a Veda. Still it does not deserve, and is unsuited for, explanation, since it does not constitute proof. The Veda is no proof, as it is difficult to show that it has any sign of that character. Some define proof as the instrument of perfect apprehension ; others say, it is that which conducts us to what was not before comprehended. But neither of these definitions can be reasonably applied to the Veda. For the Veda consists of *Mantra* and *Brahmana*. Of these mantras some convey no meaning. Thus one is *amyak sā ta*, etc. ; another is *yadriśmin*, etc. ; a third is *śrīnyera*, etc. The texts *āpāntu*,³² etc., and others are further examples. Now no meaning whatever is to be perceived through these mantras ; and when they do not even convey an idea at all, much less can they convey a perfect idea, or be instruments of comprehension. Even if the mantra *adhalā ścid āśid upari ścid āśid*, ‘was it below or above?’ (R. V. x. 129, 5) convey a meaning, still, like such sayings as ‘either a post or a man,’ it conveys a dubious mean-

³¹ The same thing had been said before by Śankāra Achāryya (who lived at the end of the 8th or beginning of the 9th century, A.D. See Colebrooke's Misc. Essays, i. 332), in his commentary on the Brahma Sūtras ii. 1, 1. *Vedasya hi nirapeksam svarthe prāmāṇyaṁ raver iva rūpa rishaye | purusha-ruchas̄tī tu mūlāntarāpexam svarthe prāmāṇyaṁ vakt̄i-smṛiti-vyavahitāncha iti vīprakarshāḥ*. “ For the Veda has an independent power of demonstration in respect of itself, as the sun has of manifesting forms. The words of men, on the other hand, have a power of proving themselves, which is derived from another source [the Veda], and which is separated [from its source] by the recollection of the author. Herein consists the distinction [between the two kinds of evidence].”

³² See Nirukta, v. 12, and vi. 15, and Roth's illustrations. It is not necessary for my purpose to inquire whether the charge of intelligibility brought against the texts is just or not.

ing, and so possesses no authority. The mantra, *deliver him, o plant*, has for its subject, grass. Another, ‘*do not hurt him, axe*,’ has for its subject an axe (*xura*). A third, ‘*hear stones*,’ has for its subject, stones. In these cases, grass, an axe, and stones, though insensible objects, are addressed in the Veda as if they were intelligent. Hence these passages have no authority, because, like the saying, ‘two moons,’ their import is absurd. So also the two texts, ‘there is one Rudra, no second has existed,’ and ‘the thousand Rudras who are over the earth,’ involving, as they do, a mutual contradiction (just as if one were to say, ‘I have been silent all my life’), cannot be authoritative. The mantra *āpa undantu* expresses the wetting of the sacrificer’s head with water at the time of tonsure; while the text ‘*śubhike*,’ etc. (‘garland, mount on my head and decorate my face’) expresses the placing of a garland formed of flowers on the heads of the bridegroom and bride, by way of blessing, at the time of marriage. Now, as these two last texts merely repeat a matter of common notoriety, they cannot be said to conduct us to what was not before comprehended. Wherefore the Mantra portion of the Veda is destitute of authority.

“To this we reply, the meaning of these texts ‘*amyak*,’ etc., and the others has been explained by Yāska in the Nirukta. The fact that they are not understood by persons ignorant of that explanation, does not prove any defect in the mantras. It is customary to quote here the popular maxim, ‘it is not the fault of the post that the blind man does not see it; the reasonable thing to say is that it is the man’s fault.’ The mantra ‘*adhaḥ svid*,’ etc. (‘was it above or below?’), is not intended to convey doubt, but rather to signify the extreme profundity of the supreme Essence, the cause of the world. With this view the author intimates by this turn of expression the difficulty which persons who are not versed in the deep Scriptures have, in comprehending such subjects. The same intention is manifested in the preceding mantras *ko addhā veda*, etc. (‘who knows?’ etc.) In the texts *oshade*, etc. (‘o herb,’ etc.), also the deities who preside

over these several objects are addressed by these several names. These deities are referred to by the venerable Bādarāyana in the aphorism *abhimāni-ryapadeśaḥ*. As Rudra, though only one, assumes by his power a thousand forms, there is no contradiction between the different texts which relate to him. And though the moistening, etc., of the head by water, etc., is a matter of common notoriety, yet as the goodwill of the god who resides in these objects is not generally known, the text in question, by having that for its subject, is declaratory of what is unknown. Hence the Mantra portion of the Veda, being shown to have the characteristic mark [of constituting proof], is authoritative."

Sāyana then, in p. 11 of his Preface, proceeds to extend his argument to the Brahmanas, and concludes (p. 19) that the authority of the whole Veda is proved.

II.—The second passage which I shall quote is from the *Vedārtha-prakāśa* of Mādhaba Āchāryya on the Taittirīya Yajurveda (pp. 1 ff. in the *Bibliotheca Indica*). Mādhaba was the brother of Sāyana, and flourished in the middle of the 14th century. (Colebrooke's *Misc. Ess.* i. 301.) *Nanu ko'yaṁ vedo nāma ke vā asya rishaya-prayojana-sambandhādhikārinah kathaṁ vā tasya prāmānyam | na khalu etasmin sarrasmīn asati redo ryākhyāna-yogyo bharati | Atrochyate | Ishtaprāpty-anishṭa-parihārayor alaukikam upāyaṁ yo grantho vdayati sa vedaḥ | Alaukika-padca pratyaxānumānē ryākurtyete | Anubhāyamā-nasya srak-chandana-ranitāder ishṭa-prāpti-hetutvam aushadha-sevāder anishṭa-pavīhāra-hetutrañcha pratyaxu-siddham | Svenā-nubhavishyamānasya purushāntara-gatasya cha tathātram anumāna-gamyam | Etaṁ tarki bhāri-janma-gata-sukhādikam api anumāna-gamyam iti chet | na | tadriśeshasya anaragamāt | Na khalu jyotishṭomādir ishṭaprāptihetuḥ kalañja-bharana-rarjanādir anishṭaparihāra-hetur ity amum artham veda-ryatirekena anumāna-sahasreñāpi tārkika-śiromānīr apy asyāragantum śaknoti | Tasmād alaukikopāya-bodhako veda iti laxanasya nātivyāptaṁ | ata evoktam | 'Pratyaxenānumityā vā yas tūpāyo na budhyate | Etaṁ vindunti redena tasmād redasya redatā'*

iti | sa evopāyo vedasya vishayaḥ | tad bodha eca prayojanam |
 tad bodhārthī cha adhikārī | tēna saha upakāryyopakāraka-bhā-
 vanah sambandhaḥ | nanu evaṁ sati strī-śūdra-sahitāḥ sarve vedā-
 dhikārinah syur iṣṭam me syād anishtam mā bhūd iti āśishah
 sārvajaninatrāt | maiwam | strī-śūdrayoh saty upāyc bodhār-
 thitce hetautareṇa redādhikārasya pratibaddhatrāt | upanīta-
 syairā adhyayanādhikāram bruvat śāstram anupanītayoh strī-
 śūdrayor vedādhyayanam anishta-prāpti-hetur iti bodhayati |
 kathaṁ tarhi tayos tadupāyāvagamaḥ | purāṇādibhir iti brū-
 mah | ata croktam | strī-śūdra-driḍjabandhānām trayī na śruti-
 gocharā | iti Bhāratam ākhyānam muninā kṛipayā kṛitam | iti |
 tasmād upanītair era traivarnikair vedasya sambandhaḥ | tat-
 prāmānyantu bodhakatvāt scuta era siddham | paurushya-rāk-
 yantu bodhakam api sat purusha-gata-bhrānti-mālatra-sambhā-
 vanayā tatparihārāya mūla-pramāṇam apexate na tu vedaḥ,
 tasya nityatrena vaktri-dosha-śuṅkānudayāt | . . . Nanu redo
 'pi Kālidāsādī-vākyacut paurushya era Brahma-kāryyatva-
 śravaṇāt | 'richah sāmāni jajñire | chhundāṁsi jajñire tas-
 mād yajus tasmād ajāyata' iti śrutch | ata era Bādarāya-
 nah 'śāstrayonitcād' iti sūtrēṇa Brahmano veda-kāraṇatvam
 avocat | maiwam | śrutiśritibhāṁ nityatvāragamāt | 'cāchā
 Virūpa nityayā' iti śrutch | 'anādi-nidhanā nityā rāg utsṛiṣṭā
 sravambhurā' iti smṛiteścha | Bādarāyaṇo 'pi devaratādhika-
 rane sūtrayāmāsa 'ata era cha nityatvam' iti | tarhi pa-
 raspara-virodha iti chet | na | nityatrasya ryārahārikatvāt
 śrishter ūrdhvām saṁhārāt pūrram ryārahāra-kālas tasmin
 utpatti-vināśādarśanāt | kālākāśādayo yathā nityā evaṁ redo
 'pi ryārahāra-kāle Kālidāsādī-vākyarat purusha-virachitatvā-
 bhāvād nityaḥ | ādisṛiṣṭau tu kālākāśādirad era Brahmanah
 sakāśād vedaotpattir āmnāyatc | ato vishaya-bhedād na paraspara-
 virodhaḥ | Brahmano nirdoshatvena vedasya vaktri-doshābhāvāt
 svatassiddham prāmāṇyaṁ tadarastham | tasmāl laxāṇa-pra-
 māṇa-sadbhāvād vishaya-prayojana-sambandhādhikāri-sadbhāvāt
 prāmānyasya susthatvāchcha veda vyākhatavya era.

" Now, some may ask, what is this Veda, or what are its sub-

ject-matter, its use, its connection, or the persons who are competent to study it? and how is it authoritative? For, in the absence of all these conditions, the Veda does not deserve to be expounded. I reply : the book which makes known (*vedayati*) the supernatural (*lit. non-secular*) means of obtaining desirable objects, and getting rid of undesirable objects, is the Veda. By the employment of the word *supernatural*, [the two ordinary means of information, viz.] *perception* and *inference*, are excluded. By *perception* it is established that such things as garlands, sandal wood, and women are causes of gratification, and that the use of medicines and so forth is the means of getting rid of suffering. And we ascertain by *inference* that we shall in future experience, and that other men now experience, the same things. If it be asked whether, then, the happiness, etc., of a future birth be not in the same way ascertainable by inference, I reply that it is not, because we cannot get beyond generalities. Not even the most brilliant ornament of the logical school could, by a thousand inferences, without the help of the Vedas, discover the truths that the *jyotish-homa* and other sacrifices are the means of attaining happiness, and that abstinence from the flesh of an animal³³ struck with a poisoned arrow is the means of removing uneasiness. Thus it is not too wide a definition of the Veda to say that it is *that which indicates supernatural expedients*. Hence, it has been said, ‘men discover by the Veda those expedients which cannot be ascertained by perception or inference; and this is the characteristic feature of the Veda.’ These expedients, then, form the *subject* of the Veda ; [to teach] the knowledge of them is its *use*; the person who seeks that knowledge is the *competent student*; and the *connection* of the Veda with such a student is that of a benefactor with the individual who is to be benefitted.

“ But, if such be the case, it may be said that all persons

³³ The only other sense of the word *kalañja* in Bochtlin's and Roth's Lexicon is *tobacco*. It may be doubtful, however, if that weed was known in India when this commentary was written; and perhaps the illustration may be a traditional one, derived from an earlier age. See Müller in the Z. D. M. G. vii. pp. 376, 377.

whatever, including women and sūdras, must be competent students of the Veda, since the aspiration after good and the deprecation of evil are common to the whole of mankind. But it is not so. For though the expedient exists, and women and sūdras are desirous to know it, they are debarred by another cause from being competent students of the Veda. The scripture (*sāstra*) which declares that those persons only who have been invested with the sacrificial cord are competent to read the Veda, intimates thereby that the same study would be a cause of unhappiness to women and sūdras [who are not so invested]. How, then, are these two classes of persons to discover the means of future happiness? We answer, from the Puranas and other such works. Hence it has been said, 'since the triple Veda may not be heard by women, sūdras, and degraded twice-born men, the Mahābhārata was, in his benevolence, composed by the Muni.' The Veda, therefore, has only a relation to men of the three superior classes who have obtained investiture.

"Then the authority of the Veda is self-evident, from the fact of its communicating knowledge. For though the words of men also communicate knowledge, still, as they must be conceived to participate in the fallibility of their authors, they require some primary authority to remedy that fallibility. But such is not the case with the Veda; for as that had no beginning, it is impossible to suspect any defect in the utterer. . . .

"A doubt may, however, be raised whether the Veda is not, like the works of Kālidāsa and others, *derived from a personal being*,³⁴ as it is said in the Veda to have been formed by Brahma, according to the text, 'the Rik and Sāma verses, the metres sprang from him; from him the Yajush was produced';³⁵ in consequence of which Bādarāyana, in the aphorism³⁶ 'since he is the source of the *sāstra*,' has pronounced that Brahma is the cause of the Veda.

³⁴ This seems to be the only way to translate *paurusheya*, as *purusha* cannot here mean a human being.

³⁵ R. V. x. 90, 9, quoted in the first Part of this work, pp. 7, 8.

³⁶ Brahma Sūtras, i. 1, 3, p. 7 of Dr. Ballantyne's Aphorisms of the Vedānta.

But this doubt is groundless ; for the eternity of the Veda has been declared both by itself, in the text, 'with an eternal voice, o Virūpa,'³⁷ and by the Smṛiti in the verse 'an eternal voice, without beginning or end, was uttered by the Self-existent.'³⁸ Bādarāyana, too, in his section on the deities (Brahma Sūtras, i. 3, 29) has this aphorism, 'hence also [its] eternity [is to be maintained].' If it be objected that these authorities are mutually conflicting, I answer, No. For [in the passages where] the word *eternity* is applied to the Vedas, it is to be understood as referring to the period of action [or mundane existence]. This period is that which commences with the creation, and lasts till the destruction of the universe, since, during this interval, no worlds are seen to originate, or to be destroyed. Just as time and ether (space) are eternal, so also is the Veda eternal, because, during the period of mundane existence, it has not been composed by any person, as the works of Kālidāsa and others have been.³⁹ Nevertheless, the Veda, like time and space, is

³⁷ These words are part of Rig-veda, viii 64, 6.—*Tasmān nānum abhūlyare vāchā Virūpa nityayā | vrishye chandasra sushtutum* “Send forth praises to this heaven-aspiring and prolific Agni, o Virūpa, with an unceasing voice [or hymn].” The word *nityayā* seems to mean nothing more than *continual*, though in the text I have rendered it *eternal*, as the author's reasoning seems to require. Colebrooke (Misc. Ess. i. 306), however, translates it by “perpetual.” I shall again quote and illustrate this verse further on.

³⁸ This line, from the M. Bh. Sāntip. 8,533, has been already cited above in p. 4. The Calcutta text, from which I have there quoted, gives *ridyā* instead of *nityā*, the reading of the Vedārtha-prakāśa in this passage. It is possible that the line may be found also in some of the Puranas.

³⁹ The same subject is touched on by Śūyana, at p. 20 of his commentary, in these words :—*Nanu bhagavatā Bādarāyagenā Vedasya Brahma-lāryyatram sūtritam | śāstra-yonitrād* iti | *rīgvedādi-śāstra-kūrayatvād* Brahma sārvajñam iti *sūtrārthaḥ* | *bādhām* | *na etatā paurushyatvam bharati* | *manushya-nirmitatvābhāvāt* | *idriśam apaurushyatvam abhipretya vyarahāra-dusāyām ākāśādi-rād nityatvam* *Bādarāyagenāiva devatādīlikaraye sūtritam* | ‘ata eva cha nityatvam’ iti. “But it is objected that the venerable Bādarāyana has declared in the aphorism ‘since he is the source of the śāstra’ (Brahma Sūtras i 1, 3), that the Veda is derived from Brahma; the meaning of the aphorism being, that since Brahma is the cause of the Rīg-veda and other Śāstras, he is omniscient. This is true; but it is not sufficient to prove the human origin of the Veda, since it was not formed by a man. Bādarāyana had in view such a superhuman origin of the Veda, when in the [other] aphorism ‘hence also [its] eternity is to be maintained,’ (which is contained in the section on the deities), he declared its eternity, like that of space, etc., during the period of mundane existence.”

recorded in Scripture to have originated from Brahma at the first creation. There is, therefore, no discrepancy between the two different sets of passages, as they refer to different objects. And since Brahma is free from defect, the utterer of the Veda is consequently free from defect; and therefore a self-evincing authority resides in it. Seeing, therefore, that the Veda possesses a characteristic mark, and is supported by proof, and that it has a subject, a use, a relation, and persons competent for its study, and, moreover, that its authority is established, it follows that it ought to be interpreted."

Sect. VII.—*Arguments of the Mīmānsakas and Vedantins in support of the eternity and authority of the Vedas.*

I shall now proceed to adduce some of the reasonings by which the authors of the Pūrvā Mīmānsā, and Vedānta aphorisms, and their commentators, defend the doctrine which, as we have already seen, is held by some of the Indian writers, that the Vedas are eternal, as well as infallible.

I. *Pūrvā Mīmānsā*.—I quote the following texts of the Pūrvā Mīmānsā which relate to this subject from Dr. Ballantyne's aphorisms of the Mīmānsā, pp. 8 ff. I do not always follow the words of Dr. Ballantyne's translations, though I have made free use of their substance. (See also Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 306, or p. 195 of W. and N.'s. edit.) The commentator introduces the subject in the following way :—*Śabdārthayor utpattyayanataram purushēya kalpita-saṅketatāmaka-sambandhasya kalpitatvāt purusha-kalpita-sambandha-jñānāpexitrāt śabdāsyā yathā prat-*

The remarks of Śankara on the Brahma Sūtra (i. 1, 3) above referred to, begin as follows :—*Mahata rig-vedādēh sūstrasya aneka-vidyā-sthānopabriñhitasya pradīpatat sarvārtha-dyotinas sarvajñā-kalpasya yonih kūraṇam Brahma | na hi idrīśasya sūstrasya rigvedādi-laxanasya sarvajñā-guṇānvitasya sarevajñād anyataḥ sambhavo 'sti.* "Brahma is the source of a great Sūtra, consisting of the Rig-veda, etc., augmented by numerous branches of science, which, like a lamp, illuminates all subjects, and approaches to omniscience. Now such a Sūtra, distinguished as the Rig-veda, etc., possessed of the qualities of an omniscient being, could not have originated from any other than an omniscient being." See Dr. Ballantyne's Vedānta Aphorisms, pp. 7, 8.

yaxa-jñānam śuktikādau satyatvam ryabhicharati tathā purushā-dhīnotrena śabde 'pi satyatra-ryabhichāra-sambhavat na dharme chodunā pramāṇam iti pātra-paxe siddhāntam āha. “ Since, subsequently to the production of words and things, a conventional connection has been established between the two by the will of man, and since language is dependent upon a knowledge of this conventional connection determined by man, [it follows that] as perception is liable to error in respect of mother-of-pearl and similar objects [by mistaking them for silver], so words also may be open to convey unreal notions from [their sense] being dependant on human will ; and consequently that the Vedic precepts [which are expressed in such words, possessing a merely conventional and arbitrary meaning] cannot be authoritative in matters of duty. Such is an objection which may be urged, and in reply to which the author of the aphorisms declares the established doctrine.”

Then follows the fifth aphorism of the first chapter of the first book of the Mīmānsā :—*Autpattikastu^(a) śabdasya^(b) arthena sambandhas^(c) tasya^(d) jñānam^(e) upadeśo^(f) cyatirekaścha^(g) arthe 'nupalabdhic^(h) tat⁽ⁱ⁾ pramāṇam Bādarāyaṇasya anapexatvāt* | which may be paraphrased as follows :—“ The connection of a word with its sense is coeval with the origin of both. In consequence of this connection the words of the Veda convey a knowledge of duty, and impart unerring instruction in regard to matters imperceptible. Such Vedic injunctions constitute the proof of duty admitted by Bādarāyaṇa, author of the Vedānta Sūtras, for this proof is independent of perception and all other evidence.”

I subjoin most of the remarks of the scholiast as given by Dr. Ballantyne, indicating by letters the words of the aphorism to which they refer.

(a) *Autpattikah* | *svābhārikah* | *nitya* *iti yāvat* | “ *Autpattika* (original) means natural, eternal in short.

(b) *Śabdasya* | *nitya-veda-ghaṭaka-padasya* ‘*agnihotram juhu-yāt svarga-kāma*’ *ityādeh*. “ *Śabda* (word) refers to terms

which form part of the eternal veda, such as, ‘the man who desires heaven should perform the Agnihotra sacrifice.’”

(c) *Sambandha* (connection) “in the nature of power,” i.e. according to Dr. Ballantyne, depending on the divine will that such and such words should convey such and such meanings.

(d) *Atas tasya | dharmasya |* “‘Hence’ is to be supplied before ‘this,’ which refers to ‘duty.’”

(e) *Jñānam | utra karane lyut | jñāpter yathārtha-jñānasya karanam.* “In the word *jñāna* (knowledge) the affix *lyut* has the force of ‘instrument,’ ‘an instrument of correct knowledge.’”

(f) *Upadeśah | artha-pratipādanam.* “Instruction, i.e. the establishment of a fact.”

(g) *Aryatirckah | acyabhichāri dṛṣyatे atah.* “‘Unerring,’ i.e. that which is seen not to deviate therefrom.”

(h) *Namu ‘rahnimāu’ iti śabda-śravanānantaram pratyaxena rahnīm dṛishtēā śabde pramāṇam grihṇāti iti loke prasiddheḥ pratyaxālitarā-pramāṇa-sāperatcāt śabdasya sa kathaṁ dharme pramāṇum ata āha anupalabdhe iti | anupalabdhe pratyaxādī-pramāṇair ajñātac ‘rthe.* “Since it is a matter of notoriety that any one who has heard the words ‘[the mountain is] fiery’ uttered, and afterwards sees the fire with his own eyes, is then [more than ever] convinced of the authority of the words, it may be asked how words which are thus dependent [for confirmation] on perception and other proofs, can themselves constitute the proof of duty? In reference to this, the word *anupalabdhe* (‘in regard to matters inperceptible’) is introduced. It signifies ‘matters which cannot be known by perception and other such proofs.’”

(i) *Tut | ridhi-ghaṭita-vākyam dharme pramāṇam Bādarāyan-āchāryasya sammatam | ayam āśayah | ‘parvato rahnimān’ iti doshavat-purusha-prayuktam vākyam arthaṁ vyabhicharati | atah pramāṇya-niśchaye pratyaxādikam aperate | tathā ‘gnihotram juhoti iti vākyam kāla-truye ‘py arthaṁ na vyabhicharati | ata itara-nirapecaṁ dharme pramāṇam.* “This, i.e. a [Vedic]

sentence consisting of an injunction, is regarded by Bādarāyana also as proof of duty. The purport is this. The sentence, 'the mountain is fiery,' when uttered by a person defective [in his organ of vision], may deviate from the reality; it therefore requires the evidence of our senses, etc., to aid us in determining its sufficiency as proof. Whereas the Vedic sentence regarding the performance of the Agnihotra sacrifice can never deviate from the truth in any time, past, present, or future; and is therefore a proof of duty, independently of any other evidence."

The commentator then proceeds to observe as follows:—*Pūrra-sūtre śabdārthayos sanbandho nitya ity uktam | tachcha śabdānityatvādhinam iti tat sisādhyayishur ādau śabdānityatva-rādi-matam pūrra-paxam upādayati.* “In the preceding aphorism it was declared that the connection of words and their meanings [or the things signified by them] is eternal. Desiring now to prove that this [eternity of connection] is dependent on the eternity of words [or sound], he begins by setting forth the first side of the question, viz., the doctrine of those who maintain that sound is not eternal.”

This doctrine is accordingly declared in the six following aphorisms (*sūtras*), which I shall quote and paraphrase, without citing, in the original, the accompanying comments. These the reader will find in Dr. Ballantyne's work.

Sūtra 6.—Karma eke tatra darśanāt. “Some, i.e. the followers of the Nyāya philosophy, say that sound is a product, because we see that it is the result of effort, which it would not be if it were eternal.”

Sūtra 7.—Asthānāt. “That it is not eternal, on account of its transitoriness, i.e. because, after a moment it ceases to be perceived.”

Sūtra 8.—Karoti-śabdāt. “Because we employ in reference to it the expression *making*, i.e. we speak of *making a sound*.”

Sūtra 9.—Satrāntare gāngapadhyāt. “Because it is per-

ceived by different persons at once, and is consequently in immediate contact with the organs of sense of those both far and near, which it could not be if it were one and eternal."

Sūtra 10.—*Prakṛiti-cikrityoścha.* “Because sounds have both an original and a modified form; as, e.g. in the case of *dadhi atra*, which is changed into *dadhy atra*, the original letter *i* being altered into *y* by the rules of permutation. Now, no substance which undergoes a change is eternal.”

Sūtra 11.—*Vṛiddhiścha kartṛi-bhāmnā 'syā.* “Because sound is augmented by the number of those who make it. Consequently the opinion of the Mīmānsakas, who say that sound is merely *manifested*, and not *created*, by human effort, is wrong, since even a thousand *manifesters* do not increase the object which they *manifest*, as a jar is not made larger by a thousand lamps.”

These objections against the Mīmānsaka theory that sound is manifested, and not created, by those who utter it, are controverted in the following Sūtras:—

Sūtra 12.—*Samañ tu tatra darsanam.* “But, according to both schools, viz., that which holds sound to be *created*, and that which regards it as merely *manifested*, the perception of it is alike momentary. But of these two views, the theory of manifestation is shown in the next aphorism to be the correct one.”

Sūtra 13.—*Sataḥ param adarśanāṁ rishayānāgamat.* “The non-perception, at any particular time, of sound, which, in reality, perpetually exists, arises from the fact that the utterer of sound has not come into contact with his object, i.e. sound. Sound is eternal, because we recognise the letter *k*, for instance, to be the same sound which we have always heard, and because it is the simplest method of accounting for the phenomenon to suppose that it is the same. The still atmosphere which interferes with the perception of sound, is removed by the conjunctions and disjunctions of air issuing from a speaker’s mouth, and thus sound (which always exists, though unperceived) becomes

perceptible.⁴⁰ This is the reply to the objection of its 'transitoriness' (*Sūtra 7*)."

An answer to *Sūtra 8* is given in

Sūtra 14.—*Prayogasya param*. "The word 'making' sounds, merely means employing or uttering them."

The objection made in *Sūtra 9* is answered in

Sūtra 15.—*Āditya-rad yaugayadyam*. "One sound is simultaneously heard by different persons, just as one sun is seen by them at one and the same time. Sound, like the sun, is a vast, and not a minute object, and thus may be perceptible by different persons, though remote from one another."

An answer to *Sūtra 10* is contained in

Sūtra 16.—*Varnāntaram acikārah*. "The letter *y*, which is substituted for *i* in the instance referred to under *Sūtra 10*, is not a modification of *i*, but a distinct letter. Consequently sound is not modified."

The 11th *Sūtra* is answered in

Sūtra 17.—*Nāda-vyiddhiḥ parā*. "It is an increase of *noise*, not of *sound*, that is occasioned by a multitude of speakers. The word *noise* refers to the 'conjunctions and disjunctions of the air' (mentioned under *Sūtra 13*), which enter simultaneously into the hearer's ear from different quarters; and it is of these that an increase takes place."

The next following *Sūtras* state the reasons which support the *Mīmānsaka* view:—

Sūtra 18.—*Nityastu syād darsanasya pararthatrāt*. "Sound must be eternal, because its utterance is intended to convey a meaning to other persons. If it were not eternal [or abiding], it would not continue till the hearer had learned its sense, and thus he would not learn the sense, because the cause had ceased to exist."

⁴⁰ "Sound is unobserved, though existent, if it reach not the object (vibrations of air emitted from the mouth of the speaker proceed and manifest sound by their appulse to air at rest in the space bounded by the hollow of the ear; for want of such appulse, sound, though existent, is unapprehended)."—Colebrooke i. 306.

Sūtra 19.—*Sarvatra yaugapadyāt.* “ Sound is eternal, because it is in every case correctly understood by many persons simultaneously ; and it is inconceivable that they should all at once fall into a mistake.”

When the word *go* (cow) has been repeated ten times, the hearers will say that the word *go* has been ten times pronounced, not that ten words having the sound of *go* have been uttered ; and this fact also is adduced as a proof of the eternity of sound in

Sūtra 20.—*Sankhyābhārāt.* “ Because each sound is not numerically different from itself repeated.”

Sūtra 21.—*Anapekṣatrāt.* “ Sound is eternal, because we have no ground for anticipating its destruction.”

“ But it may be urged that sound is a modification of air, since it arises from its conjunctions (see *Sūtra 17*), and because the Śikshā (or Vedāṅga treating of pronunciation) says that ‘ air arrives at the condition of sound ; ’ and as it is thus produced from air, it cannot be eternal.” A reply to this difficulty is given in

Sūtra 22.—*Prakhyābhārāchcha yogyasya.* “ Sound is not a modification of air, because, if it were, the organ of hearing would have no appropriate object which it could perceive. No modification of air (held by the Naiyāyikas to be *tangible*) could be perceived by the organ of hearing, which deals only with intangible sound.”

Sūtra 23.—*Linga-darśanāchcha.* “ And the eternity of sound is established by the argument discoverable in the Vedic text, ‘ with an eternal voice, o Virūpa.’ (See above, p. 51). Now, though this sentence had another object in view, it, nevertheless, repeats the eternity of language, and hence sound is eternal.”

“ But though words, as well as the connection of word and sense, be eternal, it may be objected—as in the following aphorism—that a command conveyed in the form of a sentence is no proof of duty.”

Sūtra 24.—*Utpattau rā rachanāḥ syur arthasya atannimitrāt.* “ Though there be a natural connection between words

and their meanings, the connection between *sentences* and their meanings is a factitious one, established by human will, from these meanings (of the sentences) not arising out of the meanings of the words. The connection of sentences with their meanings is not (like the connection of words with their meanings) one derived from inherent *power* (see Sūtra 5, remark (c), above, p. 54), but one devised by men ; how, then, can this connection afford a sufficient authority for duty ?”

An answer to this is given in

Sūtra 25.—*Tad-bhātānām kriyārthena samāmnāyo 'rthasya tannimittatrāt.* “The various terms which occur in every Vedic precept are accompanied by a verb, because a perception (such as we had not before) of the sense of a sentence is derived from a collection of words involving a verb. For a precept is not comprehended unless the individual words which make it up are understood ; and the comprehension of the meaning of a sentence is nothing else than the comprehension of the exact mutual relation of the meanings arising out of each word.”

Sūtra 26.—*Loke sanniyamāt prayoga-sannikarshah syāt.* “As in secular language the application of words is fixed, so also in the Veda they must be employed in an established sense which has been handed down by tradition.”

The author now proceeds in the next following Sūtras to state and to obviate certain objections raised to his dogmas of the eternity and authority of the Vedas.

Sūtra 27.—*Vedāṁśchайke sunnikarsham purushākhyāḥ.* “Some (the followers of the Nyāya) declare the Vedas to be of recent origin, i.e. not eternal, because the names of men are applied to certain parts of them, as the Kāthaka and Kauthuma.”

This Sūtra, with some of those which follow, is quoted in Sāyana’s commentary on the R. V. vol. i. pp. 19 and 20. His explanation of the present Sūtra is as follows :—

Yathā Raghurāṁśādaya idānīntanās tathā vedā api | na tu vedā anādayah | ata eva veda-karitṛitvēna purushā ākhyāyante | Vaiyāsikam Bhāratam Vālmīkīyam Rāmāyanam ity atra yathā

Bhāratādi-kartritcena Vyāsādaya ākhyāyante tathā Kāṭhakān Kauthumañ Taittirīyakam ity evañ tattad-veda-śākhā-kartṛitvena Kāṭhādinām ākhyātatrāt paurusheyāḥ | Nanu nityānām era vedānām upādhyāya-rat sampradāya-prararttakatrena Kāṭhakādi-sāmākhyā syād ity āśāṅkya yuktyantarañ sūtrayati | kā turhi Kāṭhakādyākhyāyikāyā gutir ity āśāṅkya sampradāya-prararttanāt sā iyam upapadyate. “Some say, that as the Raghuvanśa, etc., are modern, so also are the Vedas, and that the Vedas are not eternal. Accordingly, certain men are named as the authors of the Vedas. Just as in the case of the Mahābhāratā, which is called *Vaiyāsika* (composed by Vyāsa), and the Rāmā�ana, which is called *Vālmīkiya* (composed by Vālmīki), Vyāsa and Vālmīki are indicated as the authors of these poems; so, too, Katha, Kuthumi, and Tittiri are shown to be the authors of those particular Śākhās of the Vedas which bear their names, viz., the *Kāṭhaka*, *Kauthuma*, and *Taittiriya*; and consequently those parts of the Vedas are of human origin. In answer to this it is suggested that the Vedas, though eternal, have received the name of *Kāṭhaka*, etc., because Katha and others, as teachers, handed them down.”

This interpretation is accepted a little further on, in the remarks on one of the following Sūtras:—“What, then, is the fact in reference to the appellations *Kāṭhaka*, etc.? It is proved to have arisen from the circumstance that Katha, etc., handed down the Vedas.”

Sūtra 28.—Anitya-darśanāchcha. “It is also objected that the Vedas cannot be eternal, because we observe that persons, who are not eternal, but subject to birth and death, are mentioned in them. Thus it is said in the Veda ‘Babara Prāvahani desired,’ ‘Kusurubinda Auddālaki desired.’ Now, as the words of the Veda in which they are mentioned could not have existed before these persons were born, it is clear that these words had a beginning, and being thus non-eternal, they are proved to be of human origin.” (*Babarāḥ Prāvahāṇir akāmayata*) ‘*Kusuruvinda Auddālakir akāmayata*’ ityādi redesku darśanāt teshām

*janañat prāg imāni cākyāni nāsann iti sāditvād anityatvam pa-
rushcyatvañcha siddham.)*

These objections are answered in the following aphorisms :—

Sūtra 29.—Uktantu śabda-pūrratram. “But the priority—eternity—of sound has been declared, and, by consequence, the eternity of the Veda.”

Sūtra 30.—Ākhyā prarachanāt. “The names derived from those of particular men, attached to certain parts of the Vedas, were given on account of their studying those particular parts. Thus the portion read by Kātha was called *Kāthuka*, etc.”

Sūtra 31.—Parantu śrutiḥ sāmānyam. “And names occurring in the Veda, which appear to be those of men, are appellations common to other beings besides men.”

“Thus the words *Babura Prārahanyi* are not the names of a man, but have another meaning. For the particle *pra* denotes ‘pre-eminance,’ *rahana* means ‘motion,’ and the letter *i* represents the agent; consequently the word *prārahanyi* signifies that which moves swiftly, and is applied to the wind, which is eternal. *Babara* again is a word imitating the sound of the wind. Thus there is not even a semblance of error in the assertion that the Veda is eternal.” (*Yadyapi Babarah Prārahanyir ity asti pa-
rantu śrutiḥ prārahanyādi-śabdāḥ sāmānyam | anyārthasyāpi
rāchakum | tathā hi | ‘pra’ ityasya utkarshāśrayaḥ | ‘rahana’
śabdasya gatiḥ | ikārah karttā | tathā cha utkrishta-gatyāśrayo
vāyu-parah | sa cha anālīḥ | Babura iti vāyu-śabdānukaraṇam
iti na anupapatti-gandho ‘pi.*)

Before proceeding to the 32nd Sūtra, I shall quote some further illustrations of the 31st, which are to be found in certain passages of the Introduction to Śāyana’s Commentary on the Rig-veda, where he is explaining another section of the Mīmānsā Sūtras. The passages are as follows (p. 7) :—

*Anitya-saṁyogad mantrānarthaçyam | ‘kiñ te kriñranti kīka-
teśhv’ iti mantre kīkaṭo nāma janapada āmnātāḥ | Tathā naicha-
śākhaṁ nāma nagaram pramugando nāma rājā ity etc ‘rthā
anityā āmnātāḥ | Tathā cha sati prāk pramagandād na ayam*

mantra bhāta-pūrra iti gamyate. And in p. 10 :—*Yad apy uktam pramagandādy-anityārtha-saṁyogād muntrasya anālīcām na syād iti tatrottaram sātrayati | Uktas chānūtya-saṁyoga iti | prathama-pādasya antimādhikarane so 'yam anitya saṁyoga-dosha uktah parihrītah | Tathā hi | tatra pūrra-pāsc Vedānām paurushcyeatram vaktum kāthakaṁ kālāpakaṁ ity ādi purusha-sambandhābhidhānaṁ hetukṛitya 'anityadarśanāchcha' iti het-vantarañ sūtritam | 'Babarāḥ prārahaṇīr akāmavata' ity anityānām Babarādinām arthānām dūrśanāt tataḥ pūrvam asatt-vāt paurushcyeo veda iti tasya uttarām sūtritam 'param tu śruti-sāmānya-mātram' iti | tasya ayam arthat | yat kāthakādi-samākhyānām tat prarachana-nimittum | yat tu param Babarādyanitya-darśanām tat śabda-sāmānya-mātram na tu tatra Babarākhyah kaśchit purusho vivasitah | kintu 'babara' iti śabdām kurvan rāyur abhidhīyate | sachā prārahaṇīḥ | prakorshēṇa vahana-śilah | Ecam anyatrāpy uhanīyam.*

"It is objected that the mantras are useless, because they are connected with temporal objects. Thus in the text, 'what are thy cows doing among the Kīkatas?' (see Part Second, p. 362), a country called Kīkata is mentioned, as well as a city named Naiehasākha, and a king called Pramaganda, all of them non-eternal objects. Such being the case, it is clear that this text did not exist before Pramaganda." The answer to this is given in p. 10. "To the further objection that the mantras cannot be eternal, because such temporal objects as Pramaganda, etc., are referred to in them, an answer is given in the following Sūtra :—'The connection with non-eternal objects has been already explained.' In the last section of the first book, this very objection of the hymns being connected with non-eternal things has been stated and obviated (see above, Sūtras 28-31). For in the statement of objections, after it has first been suggested as a proof of the human origin of the Vedas, that they bear names, Kāthaka, Kālāpaka, etc., denoting their relation to men, a further difficulty is stated in a Sūtra, viz., that 'it is noticed that non-eternal objects are mentioned in the Vedas;' as, for example,

where it is said that ‘Babara Prāvahani desired.’ Now, as it specifies non-eternal objects of this kind, the Veda, which could not have existed before those objects, must be of human origin. The answer to this is given in the aphorism, ‘any further names are to be understood as common to other things.’ The meaning is this : the names *Kāthaka*, etc., are given to the Vedas because they were expounded by *Katha*, etc.; and the further difficulty arising from the names of Babara and other objects supposed to be non-eternal, is removed by such names being common to other objects [which are eternal in their nature]. No persons called *Babara*, etc., are intended by those names, for *babara* is an imitation of a sound. Hence it designates the wind, which makes the sound *babara*. And *prārahāni* refers to the same object, as it means that which *moves swiftly*. The same method of explanation is to be applied in other similar cases.”

I proceed to the 32nd Sūtra. It is asked how the Veda can constitute proof of duty when it contains such incoherent non-sense as the following : “ Jaradgava, in blanket slippers, is standing at the door and singing benedictions. A Brahman female, desirous of offspring, asks, ‘Pray, sir, what is the meaning of intercourse on the day of the new moon?’ or the following : ‘the cows attended this sacrifice.’” A reply is contained in

Sūtra 32.—*Krite rā viniyogaḥ syāt karmaṇaḥ sumbandhāt.*
“The expressions to which objection is taken may be applicable to the duty to be performed, from the relation in which they stand to the ceremony.”

As a different reading and interpretation of this Sūtra are given by Sāyana in his Commentary, p. 20, I shall quote it, and the remarks with which he introduces and follows it.

Nanu rede krachid erañ śrūyate ‘vanaspatayah satram āsata sarpāḥ satram āsata’ iti | tatra vanaspalinām achetanatrāt sar-pāñām chetanatre ‘pi vidyārahitatrād na tad-anusikthānam sambhavati | Ato ‘Jaradgaro gāyati madrakāñi’ ityādy-unmatta-bāla-vākyā-sadrīsatvāt kenachit kṛito veda ity āśaṅkyā uttarām

sūtrayati | ‘*Krite cha avinīyogaḥ syāt karmaṇaḥ samatrāt*’ | *Yadi jyotiṣṭomādi-rākyāṁ henachit puruṣeṇa kriyta tadānīm kṛite tasmin rākye svarga-sādhanatve jyotiṣṭomasya viniyogaḥ na syāt* | *sādhya-sādhana-bhāceasya puruṣeṇa jñātum aśakyat-rāt* | *śrūyate tu viniyogaḥ* | ‘*jyotiṣṭomena svarga-kāmo yajta*’ *iti* | *na cha etat unmatta-rākyā-sadriśam laukika-vidhi-rākyavat bhāveya-karaneti-kartaryatā-rāpais tribhir uṁśair upetāyā bhāvanāyā aragamāt* | *loko hi ‘brāhmaṇān bhojayed’ iti vidhān kiṁ kena katham ity ākāṣāṇīyāṁ tṛiptim uddiṣya odanena dravyena sāka-sūpāḍi-parivreshaṇa-prakāreṇa iti yathochyate* | *jyotiṣṭoma-vidhāe api scargam uddiṣya somena dravyeṇa dīxāṇīyādy-aṅgopakāra-prakāreṇa* *ityukte katham unmatta-rākyā-sadriśam bhaved iti* | *vanaspatyādi-satra-rākyam* *api na tat-sadriśam tasya satra-karmano* *jyotiṣṭomādinā samatrāt* | *yat-paro hi śabdāḥ sa śabdārtha iti nyāya-cida āhuḥ* | *jyotiṣṭomādi-rākyasya vidhāyakatvād anushtāne tātparyyam* | *vanaspatyādi-satra-rākyasya arthacādatrād prāśāṁsāyāṁ tātparyam* | *sā cha avidyā-mānenāpi karttum śakyate* | *achetanā acicāṁso* ‘*pi satram anushthitārantaḥ kim punaś chetanā vidvāṁso brāhmaṇā iti satra-stutih.* “But it will be objected that the Veda contains such sentences as this—‘ trees and serpents attended at the sacrifice.’ Now, since trees are insensible, and serpents, though possessing sensibility, are destitute of knowledge, it is inconceivable that either the one or the other should assist at the ceremony. Hence, from its resembling the silly talk of madmen and children, as where it says, ‘ Jaradgava sings songs fit only for the Madras’ (see Part Second, pp. 481 ff.), the Veda must have been composed by some man. The answer to this doubt is contained in the following Sūtra (which I can only render by a paraphrase):—‘ If prescribed by mere human authority, no rite can have any efficacy; but such ceremonies as the jyotiṣṭoma rest on the authority of the Veda; and texts such as that regarding the *trees* and *serpents* have the same intention, i.e. to command sacrifice.’ If the sentence enjoining the *jyotiṣṭoma* sacrifice had been composed by any man, that

sacrifice, enjoined by such an authority, would not have been applicable as a means of attaining paradise; for no man can know what is the means of accomplishing such an end. But the application in question is prescribed in the *Veda* by the words 'let him who seeks paradise, sacrifice with the *jyotish-toma*.' Now this injunction does not resemble the talk of a madman, since we recognize in it, as in injunctions of a secular kind, the contemplation of the three necessary modes of the action to be performed. For, as when a question is put in regard to the *object* for which, the *instrument* through which, and the *manner* in which the secular precept, 'to feed Brahmins,' is to be fulfilled,—we are told that the object is to be their *satisfaction*, the instrumental substance *boiled rice*, and the manner *that it is to be served up with vegetables and condiments*; in the same way, in the Vedic injunction regarding the *jyotish-toma*, we are told that *paradise* is the object, that *soma* is the instrumental substance, and that the application of the *introductory and other portions of the ritual* is the manner. And when this is so, how can this precept be compared to the talk of a madman! Nor does the sentence regarding *trees, etc., attending at a sacrifice* admit of such a comparison, since the sacrifice in question is similarly circumstanced with the *jyotish-toma*. For the logicians say that the meaning of a word is *the sense which it is intended to intimate*. The purport of the sentence regarding the *jyotish-toma*, which is of a *preceptive* character, is to command performance. The object of the sentence regarding *trees, etc., attending at a sacrifice*, which is of a narrative character, is *eulogy*; and this can be offered even by an insensible [?] object. The sacrifice is eulogized by saying that it was celebrated even by insensible trees and ignorant serpents: how much more, then, by Brahmins possessed both of *sensation and knowledge!*"

II.—*The Vedānta*.—I proceed to adduce the reasonings by which Bādarāyaṇa, the author of the Brahma, Vedānta, or Śāṅkara Sūtras, as expounded by Śāṅkara Āchāryya in his

Śārīraka-māmāṁsā-bhāshya, or commentary on those Sūtras, corroborates the arguments of Jaimini in regard to the eternity and consequent authority of the Veda. After discussing the question whether any persons but Hindus of the three highest tribes are qualified for divine knowledge, the author of the Sūtras comes to the conclusion that Śūdras, or persons of the fourth tribe, are incompetent, while beings superior to man, the gods, are competent (Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 348, or p. 223 of W. and N.'s ed.) In Sūtra i. 3, 26, the author determines that the gods have a *desire* for final emancipation, owing to the instability of their power, and a *capacity* for acquiring a knowledge of Brahma, because they are *corporeal* beings; and that there is no obstacle which prevents their attaining such divine knowledge. A difficulty, however, having been raised that the gods cannot be corporeal, because, if they were so, it is necessary to conceive that they would be corporeally present at, and form (as priests actually do) a part of the ceremonial of, sacrifice, which would not consist with the usual course of such ceremonies, at which the gods are not seen to be corporeally present, and would, in fact, involve an impossibility, since Indra, for example, being but one, could not be corporeally present at numerous sacrifices at once;—this difficulty is solved (under Sūtra i. 3, 27) in two ways, either by supposing (1) that the gods assume different forms, and are present at many sacrifices at once, though invisible to mortals; or by considering (2) that, as a sacrifice is offered to a deity, many persons may present their oblations to that deity at once, just as one Brahman may be saluted by many different persons at the same time. It is, therefore, concluded that the corporeal nature of the gods is not inconsistent with the practice of sacrifice. Having settled these points, Śankara comes to Sūtra i. 3, 28.

' Śabda iti chet | na | atah prabhārāt | pratyaxānumānā-bhyām.'

Mā nāma vigrahārattre devādīnām abhyupagamyamāne kar-
manī kaścid virodhaḥ prasañji | śabde tu virodhaḥ prasajyeta |

katham | ‘Autpattikam hi śabdasya arthena sambandham āśritya
 ‘anapexatrād’ iti redasya prāmānyam sthāpitum | Idānīntu
 vigraharati devatā ‘bhūyupagamyamānā yudhyapya aiśvaryya-yogād
 yugapad aneka-karma-sambandhīni harīmshī bhūṣjita tathāpi
 vigraha-yogād asmadādi-raj janana-maraṇaratā sā iti nityasya
 śabdasya anityena arthena nitya-sambandhe pralīyamāne yad
 raidikē śabde prāmānyam sthitam tasya rīrodhaḥ syād iti chet |
 na ayam apy asti rīrodhaḥ | kasmād ‘ataḥ prabhārāt’ | Ata era
 hi raidikāt śabdād devādikām jagat prabhārati | Nanu ‘jan-
 mādi asya yataḥ’ (Brahma Sūtras i. 1, 2) iti brahma-prabhārat-
 vām jagato rādhārītaṁ katham iha śabda-prabhāratvam uchyate |
 Apicā yadi nāma raidikāt śabdād asya prabhāro ‘bhūyupagataḥ
 katham etāvatā rīrodhaḥ śabde parihṛitah | yāratā Vasavo
 Rudrā Ādityā Viśvederā Maruta ity etc ‘rthā anityā era utpatti-
 mattatāt | Tad-anityatce cha tad-rāchakānam raidikānām Vas-
 vādi-śabdānām anityatvām kena rāryyyate | Prasiddhaṁ hi loke
 Devadattasya putre utpanne Yajñadatta iti tasya nāma kriyate
 iti | Tasmād rīrodha eva śabde iti chet | na | Garādi-śabdārtha-
 sambandha-nityatva-darśanāt | Na hi garādi-ryaktinām utpatti-
 mattre tad-ākṛtinām apy utpattonatvām syād dravya-guṇa-kar-
 maṇām hi ryaktaya era utpadyante na ākṛitayah | Ākṛitibhīścha
 śabdānām sambandho na ryaktibhīḥ | ryaktinām ānanyatāt sam-
 bandha-gruhaṇānupapatteḥ | Vyaktishu utpadyamānāsrapy ākṛi-
 tinām nityatvād na garādi-śabdeshu kaścid rīrodha dṛiṣyate |
 Tathā devādi-ryakti-prabhārābhūyupagame ‘pi ākṛiti-nityatvād na
 kaścid Vasvādi-śabdeshu rīrodha iti drushtaryam | Ākṛiti-
 viśeṣas tu devādinām muntrārtha-rādālibhyo vigravarattrādy-
 acagamād aragantayāḥ | Sthāna-viśeṣa-sambandha-nimittascha
 Indrādi-śabdāḥ senāpatyādi-śabda-rat | Tatuścha yo yas tat tat
 sthānam adhītishthuti sa sa Indrādi-śabdair abhidhīyate iti na
 dosho bhavati | Na cha idāś śabda-prabhāratvam Brahma-pra-
 bhāratva-vad upādāna-kāraṇatvābhīprāyena uchyate | kathaṁ
 tarhi sthiti-vāchakātmanā nitye śabde nityārtha-sambandhīni
 śabda-ryavāhāra-yogyārtha-ryakti-nishpattir ‘ataḥ prabhāra’
 ity uchyate | katham punar aragamyaścī śabdāt prabhārati jagad

iti | ‘pratyaxānumānābhīyām’ | Pratyaxām śrutih | prāmāṇyam
 prati anapexatvāt | anumānaṁ smṛtiḥ | prāmāṇyam prati sāpe-
 atvāt | Te hi śabda-pūrrām śishtīm darśayataḥ | ‘Eta’ iti rai pra-
 jāpatir derān asrījata ‘asrīgram’ iti manushyān ‘indara’ iti pīṭīm
 ‘tīraḥ pāvitram’ iti grahān ‘āśaca’ iti stotram ‘vīcām’ iti śastram
 ‘abhi saubhagā’ ity anyāḥ prajā iti śrutih | Tathā ‘nyatrāpi ‘sa
 manasā rācham mithunām samabhārad’ ityādinā tatra tatra
 śabda-pūreikā śishtīḥ śrācyate | Smṛtitir apि ‘anādi-nidhanā
 nityā rāg utsrīshṭa scayambhūrā | ādau redamayī dīryā yataḥ
 sarebhiḥ prarīttayāḥ’ ity utsargo ‘py uyaṁ rāchāḥ sampradāya-
 pravarittanātmuko drashtaryāḥ anādi-nidhanāyāḥ anyādriśasya
 utsargasya asambharāt | Tathā ‘nāma-rūpañcha bhātānām kar-
 manāñcha prararttanam | Veda-śabdebhya erādau nirmame sa
 māheścarāḥ’ iti | ‘sarevshāñcha sa nāmāni karmāṇi cha pīthak
 pīthak | Veda-śabdebhya erādau pīthak saṁsthāñcha nirmame’
 iti cha | Apicha chikirṣhtam artham anutishṭhan tasya rāch-
 akām śabdām pūrrām smṛitvā paśchāt tam artham anutishthoti
 iti sarveshām naḥ pratyavam etat | Tathā prajāpater api srash-
 tuḥ śishteh pūrrām vaidikāḥ śabdā manasi prādurbabbhāvuh
 paśchāt tad-anugatān arthān susarīja iti gamyate | Tathā cha
 śrutih ‘sa bhūr iti ryāharan bhūmim asrījata’ ityeraṁādikā
 bhūrādi-śabdebhya era manasi prādurbhātēbhyo bhūr-ādi-lokān
 prādurbhūtān śishtān darśayati | kiṁātmakam punaḥ śabdām
 abhipretya idām śabda-prabhāvatram uchyate | sphotum ityāha |
 . . . Tasmād nityāt śabdlāt sphoṭa-rūpād abhidhāyakāt kriyā-
 kāraka-phala-laxanaṁ jagad abhidhāya-bhūtum prabhāratī |
 . . . Tutaścha nityebhyah śabdebhyo derādi-ryaktinām prabhara
 ity ariruddham.

Sūtra i. 3, 29. ‘Ata era cha nityatram’ | sratantrasya kart-
 tuḥ smaranād era hi sthite vedasya nityatre derādi-ryakti-pra-
 bharābhyupagamena tasya virodhām āśaṅkya ‘ataḥ prabhāraḥ’
 iti parihṛitya idānīn tad era reda-nityatram sthitām draḍha-
 yati ‘ata era cha nityatram’ iti | ata era cha nityatākṛiter
 devāder jagato veda-śabda-prabhāvatrād era veda-śabda-nityat-
 ram api pratyetanyam | Tathā cha mantra-varnah ‘yajñena

rāchah padarīyam āyan tām ancarindain ūshishu pravishṭām' iti sthitām eva rācham anucinnām darśayati | Vedāryāsaścha crām eva smarati | 'yugānte' utarhitān vedān setihāsān maharshayah | lebhire tupasā pūrram anyūnātāh sruyambhuca' iti.

"Sūtra i. 3, 28 :—‘But it is said that there will be a contradiction in respect of sound (or the word); but this is not so, because the gods are produced from it, as is proved by intuition and inference.’

“Be it so, that though the corporeality of the gods, etc., be admitted, no contradiction will arise in respect of the ceremonial. Still [it will be said that] a contradiction will arise in regard to the *word*. How? [In this way.] By founding upon the ‘inherent connection of a word with the thing signified,’ the authority of the Veda had been established by the aphorism ‘*anapex-atrāt*,’ etc. (*Mīmānsā Sūtras* i. 2, 21; see above, p. 58.) But now, since it has been asserted that the deities are corporeal, it will follow that (though from their possession of divine power they can at one and the same time partake of the oblations offered at numerous sacrifices), they will still, owing to their corporeality, be subject, like ourselves, to birth and death; and hence, the eternal connection of the eternal word with an object which is non-eternal being lost, a contradiction will arise in regard to the authority proved to belong to the word of the Veda; [for thus the word, not having any eternal connection with the non-eternal thing, could not be eternal, and not being eternal, could not be authoritative]. But this supposed contradiction has no existence. How? ‘Because they are produced from it.’ Hence the world of gods, etc., is produced from the Vedic word. But according to the aphorism (*Brahma Sūtras* i. 1, 2) ‘from him the production, etc., of all this is derived,’ it is established that the world has been produced from Brahma. How, then, is it said here that it is produced from the word? And, moreover, if it be allowed that the world is produced from the Vedic word, how is the contradiction in regard to the word thereby removed, inasmuch as all the following classes of beings, viz., the Vasus, Rudras,

Ādityas, Viśvedevas, Maruts, are non-eternal, because produced ; and when they are non-eternal, what is there to bar the non-eternity of the Vedic words *Vasu*, etc., by which they are designated ? For it is a common saying, ‘ *When a son is born to Dēradatta, that son receives the name of Yajnadatta,*’ [i.e. no child receives a name before it exists]. Hence a contradiction does arise in regard to [the eternity of] the word. To this objection we reply with a negative ; for in the case of such words as *cow* we discover an eternal connection between the word and the thing. For although *individual cows*, etc., *come into existence*, the species to which they belong does not *begin to exist*, as it is individual substances, qualities, and acts, which begin to exist, and not their species. Now it is with species that words are connected, and not with individuals, for as the latter are infinite, such a connection would in their case be impossible. But as species are eternal (though individuals begin to exist) no contradiction is discoverable in the case of such words as *cow*, etc. In the same way it is to be remarked that though we allow that the individual gods, etc., have commenced to exist, there is no contradiction [to the eternity of the Vedic word] in the [existence of the] words *Vasu*, etc. [which denote those individual gods], since species are eternal. And the fact that the gods, etc., belong to particular species may be learned from this, that we discover their corporeality and other attributes in the hymns and *arthārādas* (explanatory remarks in the Vedas), etc. The words *Indra*, etc., are derived from connection with some particular post, like the words ‘ commander’ (*senapāti*), etc. Hence, whosoever occupies any particular post, is designated by the words Indra, and so forth ; and therefore Indra and the other gods belong to the species of occupants of particular posts. Thus there is no difficulty. And this derivation from the word is not, like production from Brahma, meant in the sense of evolution from a material cause. How, then (since language is eternal and connected with eternal objects), is it declared in the phrase ‘ produced from it’ that the *production* of

individual beings, in the ordinary sense of the expression, is effected by a thing (sound or language), the very nature of which it is to denote *continuance* [and not such *change* as is involved in the idea of production?] How, again, is it known that the world is produced from the word? The answer is, [it is known] ‘from intuition and inference.’ ‘Intuition’ means the Veda, because it is independent of any (other) authority. ‘Inference’ means the smriti, because it is dependent on another authority (the Veda). These two demonstrate that the creation was preceded by the word. Thus the Veda says, ‘at (or with) the word *ete (these)* Prajāpati created the gods ; at *asrigram (they were poured out)* he created men ; at *indavah (drops of soma)* he created the *pitrīs* ; at *tirah paritram (through the filter)* he created the planets ; at *āśurah (swift)* he created hymns ; at *rīcāni (all)* he created praise ; and at the words *abhi saubhagā (for the sake of blessings)* he created the other creatures.⁴¹ And in another place it is said ‘with his mind he produced speech, [as] a mate.’ (Vrih. Ar. Up. p. 50.) By these and other such texts the Veda declares that creation was preceded by the word. And when the Smriti says, ‘At first a divine voice, eternal, without beginning or end, formed of the Vedas, was uttered by Svayambhū, from which all activities [proceeded]’ (see above, p. 4, note 2), the expression *utterance* of the voice is to be regarded as employed out of deference to the customary phraseology, since it is inconceivable that a voice which was ‘without beginning or end,’ could be uttered in the same sense as other sounds. Again, we have this other text, ‘In the beginning Maheśvara created from the words of the Veda the names and forms of creatures, and their several modes of action ;’

⁴¹ I am unable to say whence this passage is derived ; but it seems to be a mystical exposition, from a Brahmana or Upanishad, of the words from Rig-veda ix. 62, 1 (= Sāma-veda ii. 180), which are imbedded in it, viz., *ete asrigram indavas tirah paritram āśurah | rīcāni abhi saubhagā*. “These hurrying drops of soma have been poured through the filter, to procure all blessings.” (See Benfey’s translation.) It was by the help of Dr. Pertsch’s alphabetical list of the initial words of the verses of the Rig-veda (in Weber’s Ind. Stud.) that I discovered the verse in question in the R. V.

and again, ‘He created in the beginning the several names, functions, and conditions of all creatures from the words of the Veda.’ (See above, p. 4, note 2.) And it is a matter of common observation to us all, that when any one is occupied with any end which he wishes to accomplish, he first calls to mind the word which expresses it, and then proceeds to effect his purpose. So, too, in the case of Prajāpati the creator, we conclude that before the creation the words of the Veda were manifested in his mind, and that afterwards he created the objects which resulted from them. Thus the Vedic text which says, ‘uttering *bhār*, he created the earth (*bhāmi*), etc.,’ intimates that the different worlds, earth and the rest, were manifested, i.e. created from the words *bhār*, etc., manifested in his mind. Of what sort, now, was this word which is intended, when it is said that the world was produced from the word? It was *sphota* (*disclosure or expression*), we are told.”

I shall not quote the long discussion (extending over two quarto pages) on which Śankara here enters, regarding this term. (See Colebrooke’s Misc. Ess. i. 305, ff.; Ballantyne’s Christianity Contrasted with Hindu Philosophy, pp. 192 ff.; the same author’s translation of the commencement of the Mahābhāshya, p. 10; and Müller’s article on the last-named work in the journal of the German Or. Soc. vii. 170). Śankara states his conclusion to be that “from the eternal word, in the form of *sphota*, which designates [all things], the object to be designated, viz., the world, under the three characters of *action*, *cause*, and the *results* of action, is produced,” and finishes his remarks on this Sūtra (i. 3, 28) by observing: “Consequently there is no contradiction in saying that the individual gods, etc., are derived from eternal words.” He then proceeds to Sūtra i. 3, 29:—“Hence results the eternity of the Vedas.” On this he observes, “The eternity of the Veda had been established by the fact that it was remembered by its Self-dependent Maker. But a doubt had been suggested that this eternity is inconsistent with the admission that individual gods, etc., have commenced to

exist. This doubt, however, having been set aside by the preceding aphorism, 'Since they are produced from it,' he now confirms the eternity of the Veda (which had been already proved) by the words of the Sūtra before us, which mean that as a result of this very fact that the world, consisting of gods and other beings belonging to fixed species, was produced from the words of the Vedas, the eternity of these Vedic words themselves also must be believed. Accordingly, the words of the hymn, 'by sacrifice they followed the path of Vāch, and found her entered into the rishis' (R. V. x. 71, 3; see Part Second, p. 220) prove that Vāch already existed when she was discovered. And in the very same way Vedavyāsa records that, 'formerly the great rishis, empowered by Svayambhu, obtained through devotion the Vedas and Itihāsas, which had disappeared at the end of the preceding *yuga*.'

SECT. VIII.—*Arguments of the followers of the Nyāya and Sāṅkhyā Systems in support of the authority of the Vedas, but against the eternity of sound.*

I.—*The Nyāya.*—The eternity of sound is, as we have already discovered from the allusions of the Mīmānsaka commentator, (above p. 55), denied by the followers of the Nyāya school. The consideration of this subject is begun in the following way in the Nyāya aphorisms of Gotama, as explained by Viśvanātha Bhaṭṭacharya in the Nyāya-sūtra-vyāpti, ii. 81.

*Vedasya prāmānyam āpta-prāmānyāt siddham | na cha idam
yujyate cedasya nityatrād ity āśaṅkāyām carṇānām anityatrāt
kathaṁ tatsamudāya-rāpasya redasya nityatcam ity āśayena
śubdānityatra-prakarayam ārabhatc | tatra siddhānta-sūtram |
'Ādimattrād aindriyakatrāt kṛitakatrād upachārāchcha' | 81 |
śabdo 'nitya ityādīḥ | ādimattrāt sakāraṇakatrāt | nanu na
sakāraṇakatrām kāṇṭha-tālrādy abhighātāder eṣājyakatrenāpy
upapatter ata āhā aindriyakatrād iti sāmānyavatree sati vahir-
indriya-janya-laukika-pratyaya-rishayatrād ity arthah |*

Aprayojakatvam āśāṅkyā āha kritaketi | kṛitake ghaṭādau yathā upachārō jñānam tathaiva kāryyatva-prakāraka-pratyaya-rishayatvād ityarthah | tathā cha kāryatrena anāhāryya-sārvalaukika-pratyaya-balād anityatram eva siddhati. “It has been proved (in the 68th Sūtra, see below) that ‘the authority of the Veda follows from the authority of the wise person who made it.’ But it may be objected that this is not a proper ground on which to base the authority of the Veda, since it is eternal. With the view of proving, in opposition to this, that since letters are not eternal, the Veda, which is a collection of letters, cannot be so either, the author of the Sūtras commences the section on the non-eternity of sound. The Sūtra laying down the established doctrine is as follows:—‘Sound cannot be eternal, as (1) it had an origin, as (2) it is cognizable by sense, and (3) it is spoken of as factitious.’ Sound is non-eternal, etc., because (1) it had a beginning, *i.e.*, because it had a cause. But it may be said that it had no *cause*, as, agreeably to the doctrine of the Mīmānsakas (see above, p. 56), the action of the throat and palate in pronunciation may merely occasion a *manifestation* of sound without *creating* it. In reply to this, it is said (2) that sound is cognizable by sense, *i.e.*, that though it belongs to a genus, it is an object of ordinary perception through an external sense.” [A different explanation given by other interpreters is next quoted, which I omit.] “Then surmising that the preceding definition may be regarded as not to the point, the author adds the words ‘as it is spoken of as factitious,’ *i.e.*, as jars and other such objects are spoken of as,—are known to be,—products, so, too, sound is distinguishable by sense as being in the nature of a product. And in consequence of this necessary [or incontrovertible?] and universal perception of its being *produced*, it is proved that it cannot be eternal.” [Two other explanations of this last clause of the Sūtra are then added.]

Leaving the reader to study the details of the discussion in Dr. Ballantyne’s aphorisms of the Nyāya (Part Second, pp.

77 ff.), I will pass over most of the Sūtras, and merely quote the principal conclusions of the Nyāya aphorist. In Sūtra 86 he says, in opposition to the 13th Sūtra of the Mīmānsa (above, p. 56);

86.—‘*Prāg uchchāraṇād anupalambhād āvaraṇādy-anupalabdhēḥ*’ | *Śabdo yadi nityah syād uchchāraṇāt prāg apy upalabhyeta śrotra-sannikarsha-satteāt* | *na cha atra pratibandhakam asti ityāha ācaraneti āvaraṇādēḥ pratibandhakasya anupalabdhyā abhāra-nirnayāt* | *deśāntara-gamanantu śabdasya amūrttatād na sambhāryate* | *atindriyānanta-pratibandhakatra-kalpanām apetya śabdānityatra-kalpanā tra lughīyasti iti bhārah.*

“‘Sound is not eternal, because it is not perceived before it is uttered, and because we do not perceive anything which should intercept it.’ If sound were eternal, it would be perceived even before it was uttered, from its being in contact with the ear. [Sound, as Dr. Ballantyne explains, is admitted to be a quality of the all-pervading ether.] And in the next words the aphorist says that there is no obstacle to its being so heard, since the non-existence of any hindrance, such as an intercepting medium, is ascertained by our not perceiving anything of that sort. And it is not conceivable that sound should have gone to another place [and for that reason be inaudible], since it has no defined form. The supposition that sound is non-eternal, is simpler than the supposition that there are an infinity of imperceptible obstacles to its perception.”

The 89th and 90th Sūtras, with part of the comments on them, are as follows :—89. ‘*Asparśatcāt*’ | *śabdo nityah* | *asparśatvād gagana-rād iti bhārah* | 90. ‘*Na karmānityatvāt*’ | *asparśatvām na śabda-nityatca-sādhakām karmanī vyabhichārāt.* 89. “It may be said that sound is eternal, from its being, like the sky, intangible. 90. But this is no proof, for the intangibility of sound does not establish its eternity, since these two qualities do not always go together; for intangibility, though predicate, e.g., of action, fails to prove its eternity.”

The 100th and following Sūtras are as follows :—100. ‘*Vinā-*

śa-kāraṇānupalabdhēḥ’ | 101. ‘*Aśravāṇa-kāraṇānupalabdhēḥ satata-śravāṇa-prasāṅgah*’ | *Yady apratyavat̄ abhāra-siddhis tadā ’śravāṇa-kāraṇasya apratyavat̄ uśravāṇam na syād iti satata-śravāṇa-prasāṅga iti bhāraḥ* || 102. ‘*Upalabhyamāne cha anupalabdhēḥ asattrād anapadeśah*’ || *Anumānādinā upalabhyamāne rināśa-kāraṇe anupalabdhēḥ abhārāt trāḍīyo hetur anapadeśah asādhaṅkāḥ asiddhatrāt janyabhāratvena rināśa-kalpanam iti bhāraḥ*. “It is said (100) that ‘sound must be eternal, because we perceive no cause why it should cease.’ The answer is (101), first, ‘that if the *non-existence* of any such cause of cessation were established by the mere fact of its not being perceived, such non-perception would occasion our hearing continually, which is an absurdity.’ And (102), secondly, ‘since such non-perception is not a fact, inasmuch as [a cause of the cessation of sound] *is* perceived, this argument falls to the ground.’ Since a cause for the cessation of sound is discovered by inference, etc., and thus the non-perception of any cause is seen to be untrue, this argument of yours proves nothing, because its correctness is not established. The purport is that we suppose, from sound being produced, that it must also be liable to perish.”

Sūtras 106—122 are occupied with a consideration of the question (above treated, pp. 56, 57, in Sūtras 10 and 16 of the Mīmānsa) whether letters can change or not. The conclusion at which Gotama arrives is, that the substance of letters cannot undergo any alteration, though they may be said to change when they are modified in quality by being lengthened, shortened, etc.

In a preceding part of the Second Book (Sūtras 57—68) Gotama treats of the Veda, and repels certain charges which are alleged against its authority. I shall quote most of these aphorisms, and cite the commentary more fully than Dr. Ballantyne has done. (See Ballantyne’s Nyāya Aphorisms, Part ii. pp. 56 ff.)

Śabdasya dṛishṭādṛishṭārthaṭakatvena drairidhyam uktam tatra

cha adrishtārthaka-śabdasya redasya prāmānyam parīxitum
 pūrra-paxayati || 57. ‘Tad-aprāmānyam anṛita-ryāghāta-pu-
 naruṣta-doshebhyaḥ’ || Tasya dṛishṭārthaka-ryatirikta-śabdasya
 redasya aprāmānyam | kutaḥ | anṛitatrādi-doshāt | tutra cha
 putreshṭi-kāryādau krachit phalānutpatti-darśanād anṛitatram |
 ryāghātah pūrrāpara-rirodhah | yathā ‘udite juhoti anuditē
 juhoti samayādhyushite juhoti | śyāco’sya āhutim abhyaruharati
 ya udite juhoti śaralo’sya āhutim abhyaruharati yo’uditē juhoti
 śyāca-śaralār asya āhutim abhyaruharato yaḥ samayādhyushite
 juhoti’ atra cha uditādi-rākyāṇām nindānumitāniṣṭa-sādh-
 natā-bodhaka-rākyā-rirodhah | paunaruktyād aprāmānyam |
 Yathā triḥ prathamām anrāha | trir uttamām anrāha | ity atra
 uttamatraṣya prathamatra-paryarasānāt triḥ kathanena cha
 paunaruktyam | eteshām aprāmānye tad-dṛishṭāntena tad-eka-
 karttṛikutrena tad-eka-jātiyutrena vā sarca-redāprāmānyam
 sādhanāyam iti bhāraḥ | siddhānta-sūtram || 58. ‘Na karma-
 karttṛi-sādhanā-raigunyaḥ’ || Na redāprāmānyam karma-karttṛi-
 sādhanā-raigunyaḥ phalābhāropapattēḥ | karmaṇaḥ kriyāyā eai-
 gunyam ayathāridhitvāli | karttur eaigunyam aridratrādi |
 sādhanāya harir-āder eaigunyam āproxitetrādi | Yathokta-kar-
 maṇaḥ phalābhare hy anṛitatram | na cha evam asti iti bhāraḥ |
 ryāghāta pariharati || 59. ‘Abhyupetya kālu-bhede dosha-vacha-
 nāt’ || na ryāghāta iti śeshaḥ | Agnyādūna-kāle udita-homādi-
 kam abhyupetya srīkritya anuditā-homādi-karaṇe pūrvaṇa-dosha-
 kathanād na ryāghāta ity arthaḥ | paunaruktyam pariherati ||
 60. Anuvādopapattēḥ-cha || chaḥ punar-arthe | anuvādopapattēḥ
 punar na paunaruktyam | nishprayojanate hi paunaruktyam
 doshaḥ | ukta-sthale tr anuvādasya upapattēḥ prayojanasya
 sambhavāt | ekādāsa-sāmidhenānām prathamottamayos tr abhi-
 dhāne hi pañchaduṣatram sambhavati | tathāchā pañchaduṣatram
 śrūyate | ‘Imam aham bhrātrīryam pañchadasārareṇa rāg-vaj-
 reṇa cha bādhe yo ’smān deeshtī yañcha rayaṁ deishma’ iti |
 Anuvādasya sārthakatram loka prasiḍḍham ity āha || 61. Vāky-
 vibhāgasya cha artha-grahaṇāt || Vākyā-ribhāgasya | anuvāda-
 trena ribhakta-rākyasya artha-grahaṇāt prayojana-srīkārāt |

śishṭair iti śeshah | śishṭā hi ridhāyakūnurādakādi-bhedena rāk-
 yām vibhajya anucādakasyāpi suprayojanatram manyante | Vede
 'py evam iti bhārataḥ | . . . Evam aprāmānya-sādhakam nirasya
 prāmānyaṁ sādhayati || 68. Mantrāyurredu-rachcha tat-prāmāny-
 yam āpta-prāmānyāt || Āptasya reda-karttuḥ prāmānyāt yathār-
 thopadīśakatrād vedasya taduktatram arthāl labdham | tena
 hetunā vedasya prāmānyam anumeyam | tatra dṛishṭāntam āha
 mantrāyurveda-rad iti | mantra rishādī-nāśakah | āyurveda-
 bhāgaścha reda-stha era | tatra sañvādena prāmānya-grahāt
 tad-dṛishṭāntena redatrārachchedena prāmānyam anumeyam |
 āptaṁ grīhitam prāmānyaṁ yatra sa redas tādrīśnā redatrena
 prāmānyam anumeyam iti kechit. "It had been declared (Nyāya
 Sūtras i. 8) that verbal evidence is of two kinds, (1) that of
 which the subject-matter is seen, and (2) that of which the sub-
 ject-matter is unseen. With the view, now, of testing the
 authority of that verbal evidence which refers to unseen things,
 viz., the Veda, Gotama states the first side of the question.
 Sūtra 57. 'The Veda has no authority, since it has the defects
 of falsehood, self-contradiction, and tautology.' That verbal
 evidence which is distinct from such as relates to visible objects,
i.e., the Veda, has no authority. Why? Because it has the
 defects of falsehood, etc. Of these defects, that of 'falsehood'
 is exemplified in the fact that we sometimes observe that no
 fruit results from performing the sacrifice for a son, or the like.
 'Self-contradiction' is a discrepancy between a former and a
 later declaration. Thus the Veda says, 'he sacrifices when the
 sun is risen; he sacrifices when the sun is not yet risen; he
 sacrifices in the morning twilight. A tawny [demon?] carries
 away the oblation of him who sacrifices after the sun has risen;
 a brindled [demon?] carries off the oblation of him who sacrifices
 before the sun has risen; and both of these two carry off the
 oblation of him who sacrifices in the morning twilight.' Now here
 there is a contradiction between the words which enjoin sacrifices
 and the words which intimate by censure that those sacrifices will
 occasion disastrous results. Again, the Veda has no authority,

owing to its ‘tautology,’ as where it is said, ‘he repeats the first thrice, he repeats the last thrice.’ For as the *lastness* ultimately coincides with [?] the *firstness*, and as there is a triple repetition of the words, this sentence is tautological. Now since these particular sentences have no authority, the entire Veda will be proved by these specimens to stand in the same predicament, since all its other parts have the same author, or are of the same character, as these portions.”

Here follows the Sūtra which conveys the established doctrine. “58. ‘The Veda is not false; it is owing to some fault in the ceremonial, or the performer, or the instrument he employs, that any sacrifice is ineffectual.’ Faults in the ceremonial are such as its not being according to rule. Faults in the performer are such as ignorance. Faults in the instrument, *i.e.*, in the clarified butter, etc., are such as its not being duly sprinkled, etc. For falsehood might be charged on the Veda, if no fruit resulted from a sacrifice when duly performed; but such is not the case.”

Gotama next repels the charge of self-contradiction in the Vedas. “59. ‘There is no self-contradiction, for the fault is only imputed in case the sacrifice should be performed at a different time from that at first intended.’ The fault imputed to these sacrifices in the text in question would [only] be imputed if, after agreeing, at the time of placing the sacrificial fire, to perform the sacrifice after sunrise, one were to change it to a sacrifice before sunrise; there is, therefore, no self-contradiction in the passage referred to.”

He next rebuts the charge of tautology. “60. ‘The Veda is not tautological, because repetition may be proper.’ The particle ‘*cha*’ means again. ‘Again, since repetition may be proper, there is no tautology.’ For repetition is only a fault when it is useless. But in the passage referred to, since repetition is proper, its utility is apparent. For when the first and the last of the *eleven sāmidhenīs* (forms of prayer used on throwing fuel into the fire) are each repeated thrice, the whole number

of verses will be made up to *fifteen*.⁴² Accordingly, this number of fifteen is mentioned in these words of the Veda, 'I smite this enemy who hates us, and whom we hate, with the last of the fifteen verses, and with the thunderbolt of my words.'"

He next observes that the advantage of repetition is commonly recognised. "61. 'And the Veda is not tautological, because the utility of this division of discourse is admitted, *i.e.*, because the necessity for a division of language, that is, of a description of language characterized as reiterative, is acknowledged by the learned. For by dividing language into the different classes of *injunctive*, *reiterative*, etc., learned men recognise the uses of the reiterative also. And this applies to the Veda.'

The author of the aphorisms then proceeds to state and to define (in Sūtras 62—67) the different sorts of discourse employed in the Veda, and to defend the propriety of reiteration. "Having thus refuted the arguments which aim at showing that the Veda is of no authority, he goes on to prove its authority. 68. 'The authority of the Veda, like that of the spells and the medical treatise, follows from the authority of the wise [person who made it].' Since a wise [person], the maker of a Veda, possesses authority, *i.e.*, is one who inculcates truth, it results from the force of the terms that the Veda was uttered by a person of this character; and by this reasoning the authority of the Veda is to be inferred. He illustrates this by the case of the spells and medical treatise. By spells (*mantra*) are meant the formulæ which neutralize poison, etc., and the section of the medical treatise (*āyurveda*) forms part of the Veda. Now as the authority of these two writings is admitted by general consent, the authority of everything which possesses the characteristics of the Veda must be inferred from this example. Some, however, explain the aphorism thus: a Veda is that in which authority is found or recognized. From such *redicity* (or pos-

⁴² If there are in all *eleven* formulæ, and *two* of these are *each* repeated *thrice*, we have $(2 \times 3 =)$ *six* to add to the *nine* (which remain of the original *eleven*), making $(6 + 9 =)$ *fifteen*. See Müller's *Anc. Sans. Lit.* pp. 89 and 393.

session of the character of a *Veda*), the authority of any work is to be inferred."

It is not necessary to regard this 68th Sūtra as expressing the ultimate grounds on which Gotama would have vindicated the authority of the Vedas against its gainsayers. It is sufficient to consider the aphorism as merely indicating the proper basis on which the great logician thought that the infallibility of the Vedas should be defended, in opposition to those who maintained that their authority was derived from their eternity. Gotama denied this eternity, and deduced the infallibility of the Vedas from the infallibility of their author. In arguing with a disbeliever in the Vedas, he would have had to prove that they had really proceeded from an infallible author.

II. *The Sāṅkhya*.—The opinions of the author of the Sāṅkhya aphorisms in regard to the authority of the Veda and the principles on which that authority depends, are contained in the 45th to the 51st aphorisms of the Fifth Book, which I extract with the comments of Vijnāna Bhikshu.⁴³ 45. ‘*Na nityatram Vedānām kāryatra-śrutēḥ*’ || ‘*Sa tapo tapyata tasmāt tapas tepānāt trayo vedā ujāyanta*’ ity ādi-śruter redānām na nityatram ity arthaḥ | reda-nityatā-vākyāni cha sajātīyānupūrū-praśāhānuchchhedu-parāni | Tarki kim paurushcaya redāḥ | na ityāha || 46. ‘*Na paurushcayatram tatkartuh prṛushasya abhāvāt*’ || iṣvara-pratishedād iti śeshāḥ | suyamam | aparaḥ karttā bharato ity ākāñkṣāyām āha || 47. ‘*Muktāmuktayor ayogyatrāt*’ || Jiran-mukta-dhurīṇo Vishṇur viśuddha-sattcatayā niratiśaya-sarvajño ‘pi vitarāgatrāt sahasra-śākha-veda-nirmāṇāyogaḥ | amuktas tv asarvajnatrād era ayogya ity arthaḥ | nanu ecam apaurushyatrād nityatram era āgatam | tatrāha || 48. ‘*Na apaurushcayatrād nityatram aṅkurādi-rat*’ || Spashṭam | nanu aṅkurādisho api kāryatvena ghaṭādi-rat paurushcayatram anumcyam | tatrāha || 49. ‘*Teshām api tadyoge dṛiṣṭa-bādhādi-prasaktih*’ || Yat paurushcayañ tach chharīra-janyam iti ryāptir loke dṛiṣṭa tas�ā

⁴³ Dr. Ballantyne's edition of the Sāṅkhya Sūtras does not, I believe, as yet extend beyond the fourth book.

bādhādir eram sati syād iti arthah | nānō Ādi-purushochcharītatrād Vedā api paurushcyā era ity āha || 50. ‘Yasmin adrishtē ‘pi kṛita-buddhir upajāyate tat paurushcyam’ || Drishtē ita adrishtē ‘pi yasmin rastuni kṛita-buddhir buddhi-pūrrakatrabuddhir jāyate tad era paurushcyam iti ryacahriyate ity arthah | etad uktam bharati | na purushochcharitatā-mātreṇa paurushyatram śrāsa-praśrāsayoh sushupti-kālinayoh paurushcyatevayarahārbhārāt kintu buddhi-pūrrakatrena | Vedāstu nihśrāsārad era adrishtā-raśād abuddhi-pūrrakā era Scayambhuro sakāśāt srayam bhavanti | ato na te paurushcyāḥ | tathā cha śrutib ‘tasyaitasya mahato bhātasya nisrasitam etad yad rigredo ity ādir’ iti | nānō eram yarthārtha-rākyārtha-jñānāpūrrakatcāt śuka-rākyasyera redānām api prāmānyām na syāt tatrāha || 51. ‘Nija-śakti-abhṛyakteḥ srataḥ prāmānyam’ || Vedānām nijā scābhāvīkī yā yathārtha-jñāna-janana-śaktis tasyā mantrāyurreddādāv abhṛyakter upalambhād akhila-redānām era srata eva prāmānyām siddhyati na raktyi-yathārtha-jñāna-mūlakatratādinā ity arthah | tathā cha Nyāya-sūtram | ‘mantrāyurreddā-prāmānyarachcha tat-prāmānyam’ iti.

“Sūtra 45. ‘Eternity cannot be predicated of the Vedas, since various texts in these books themselves declare them to have been produced.’ The sense is this, that the Vedas are proved not to be eternal by such texts as the following: ‘He performed austerity; from him, when he had thus performed austerity, the three Vedas were produced.’ [See above, p. 3.] Those other texts which assert the eternity [or perpetuity] of the Vedas refer merely to the unbroken continuity of the stream of homogeneous succession [or tradition]. Are the Vedas, then, derived from any personal author? ‘No,’ he replies in Sūtra 46. ‘The Vedas are not derived from any personal author (*paurushya*), since there is no person (*purusha*) to make them.’ We must supply the words, ‘since an *Īśvara* (God) is denied.’ The sense is easy. In answer to the supposition that there may be some other maker, he remarks, Sūtra 47, ‘No; for there could be no fit maker, either liberated or unliberated.’ Vishnu, the chief of

all those beings who are liberated even while they live,⁴⁴ though, from the pure goodness of his nature, he is possessed of perfect omniscience, would, owing to his impassiveness, be unfit to compose the Veda consisting of a thousand śākhas (branches), while any unliberated person would be unfit for the task from want of omniscience. (See Śankara's comment on Brahma Sūtras i. 1, 3; above, p. 52, note.) But does not, then, the eternity of the Vedas follow from their having no personal author? He replies (48), 'Their eternity does not result from their having no personal author, since they resemble a bud, which sprouts from some root.' This is clear. But is it not to be inferred that buds, etc., since they are products, have, like jars, etc., some personal maker? He replies (49), 'If such a supposition were applied to the Vedas, it would there also be exposed to the objection that it is contrary to what we see, etc.' Whatever is derived from a personal author is produced from a body; this is a rule which is seen to hold invariably. But if we assert that the Vedas are derived from a personal author, we contradict the rule in question, [since the Vedas evidently did not spring from any one's body].' But are not the Vedas, too, derived from a person, seeing that they were uttered by the primeval Purusha? He answers (50), 'That object only (even though it be an invisible one), which its maker is conscious of having made, can be said to be derived from [or made by] a person.' It is only those objects, be they seen or unseen, in regard to which a consciousness of design arises, that are ordinarily spoken of as made by a person. The sense is, that it is not mere utterance by a person which constitutes formation by that person (since we do not ordinarily speak of the inspirations and expirations of any person during the time of sleep, as being *formed* by that person), but only utterance with conscious design. But the Vedas proceed of their own accord from Svayambhū (the self-existent), like an expiration, by the force of *adṛishṭa* (destiny), without any consciousness on his part. Hence they are not

⁴⁴ See Colebrooke's Essays, i. 369, or p. 241 of Williams and Norgate's ed.

formed by any person. Thus the Veda says, ‘This Rig-veda, etc., is the breath of this great Being, etc.’ [See above, p. 7.] But will not the Vedas, also, be in this way destitute of authority, like the chatter of a parrot, since they did not result from any knowledge of the correct meaning of the words of which they are made up? In reference to this, he says (51), ‘The Vedas have a self-proving authority, since their inherent power is manifested.’ The self-evidencing authority of the *entire* Vedas is established by the manifestation, or perception, in certain portions of them, viz., the ‘spells’ and the ‘medical treatise,’ etc., of that inherent power which they (the Vedas) possess of generating correct knowledge, and does not depend on its being shown that they (the Vedas) are founded on correct knowledge in their utterer, or on any other ground of that sort. And to this effect is the Nyāya Sūtra, that ‘its authority is like the authority of the spells and the medical treatise.’” (See above, p. 80.)

In the 57th and following Sūtras of the same book, Kapila denies that sound has the character of *sphoṭa*, or that it is eternal. 57. ‘*Pratītyapratītibhyām na sphoṭātmakāḥ śabdaḥ*’ || *Pratyeka-varṇebhyo ’tiriktaṁ kalaśa ityādi-rūpam akhaṇḍam eka-pudam sphota iti yogair abhyupagamyate | kambu-grīvādy-avayavebhyo ’tirkto ghaṭādy-arayavīra | sa cha śabda-rīshesho padākhyo ’rtha-sphuṭikaraṇāt sphota ity uchyate | sa śabdo ’prāmāṇikāḥ | kutah | pratītyapratītibhyām | sa śabdaḥ kim pratīyate na vā | ādye yena varṇa-samudāyena ānūpurī-viśeṣa-visiṣṭena so ’bhiryajyate tasya eva artha-pratyāyakatvam astu | kim antargadūnā tena | antye tv ojñāta-sphoṭasga nāsty artha-pratyāyana-śaktir iti ryarhā sphoṭa-kalpanā ity arthaḥ | Pūrvavām vedānām nityatvam pratishiddham | idanīm varṇa-nityatvam api pratischedati* || 58. ‘*Na śabda-nityatvām hāryatā-pratīteḥ*’ || *Sa eva ayam ga-kāra ityādi-pratyabhijñā-balād varṇa-nityatvām na yuktam | utpanno ga-kāra ityādi-pratyayena anityatva-siddher ity arthaḥ | pratyabhijñā tajjātiyatā-rishayinī | anyathā ghaṭāder api pratyabhijñayā nityatāpatter iti | śāṅkate* ||

59. ‘*Pūrva-siddha-satrasya abhivyaktir dipeneva ghaṭasya*’ ||
Nanu pūrva-siddha-sattākasyaiva śabdasya dhvanyādibhir yā
‘bhavyaklis tāmnātram utpattiḥ pratīter vishayah | abhivyaktau
dṛishṭānto dipeneva ghaṭasya iti | Pariharati || 60. ‘*Satkāryya-*
siddhāntas chet siddha-sādhanam’ || *Abhivyaktir yady anāgatā-*
vasthā-tyāgena varttumānārasthā-lābha ity uchyate tadā sat-
kāryya-siddhāntah | tādṛīśa-nityatcañcha sarra-kāryāṇām eva
eva iti siddha-sādhanam ity arthaḥ | yadi cha varttamānatayā sata
eva jñāna-mātra-rūpiṇy abhivyaktir uchyate tadā ghaṭadīnām
api nityatrāpattir ityādi. “‘Sound has not the character of
sphoṭa, from the dilemma that it must be either apparent or not
apparent.’ A modification of sound called *sphoṭa*, single, indis-
visible, distinct from individual letters, existing in the form of
words like *kulaśu* (jar), distinguished also from parts of words
like *kambu-grīva* (striped-neck), and forming a whole like the
word *ghaṭa* (jar), is assumed by the Yogas. And this species
of sound called a word (*pada*) is designated *sphoṭa* from its
manifesting a meaning. But the existence of this form of sound
is destitute of proof. Why? ‘From the dilemma that it must
be either apparent or not apparent.’ Does this form of sound
appear or not? If it appears, then let the power of disclosing
a meaning [which is ascribed by our opponents to *sphoṭa*] be
regarded as belonging to that collection of letters, arranged in a
particular order, by which the supposed *sphoṭa* is manifested.
What necessity is there for that superfluous *sphoṭa*? If, on the
contrary, it does not appear, then that unknown *sphoṭa* can have
no power of disclosing a meaning, and consequently it is useless
to suppose that any such thing as *sphoṭa* exists.

“The eternity of the Vedas had been already denied. He now denies the eternity of letters also. 58. ‘Sound is not eternal, since it is clear that it is a production.’ The meaning is, that it is not reasonable to infer on the strength of the recognition of the letter G as the same that we knew before (see Mīmānsā Aphorisms i. 13; above, p. 56), that letters are eternal; since it is clear that G and other letters are *produced*,

and therefore cannot be eternal. The recognition of these letters has reference to their being of the *same kind* as we have perceived before ; since otherwise we are landed in the absurdity that, because we recognize a jar or any other such object to be the same, it must therefore be eternal.

" He expresses a doubt : 59. ' What we hear may be merely the *manifestation* of a previously existing thing, as a jar is *manifested* (not created) by the light of a lamp.' (See *Mimānsā* Aphorisms, i. 12, 13; above, p. 56.) Is it not the fact that it is merely the *manifestation* of language by sounds, etc., which begins to exist as an object of perception ? An illustration of such *manifestation* is that of a jar by means of a lamp.

" He repels this doubt : 60. ' If the axiom that an effect exists in its cause be here intended, this is merely proving what is already admitted.' If by *manifestation* is meant the relinquishment by any substance of its previous undeveloped state,⁴⁵ and the attainment of its present developed state, then we have merely the recognized principle of an effect virtually existing in its cause (see *Sankhya Karika* Aph. ix.); and as such eternity is truly predicable of all effects whatever, it is *proroging a thing already proved* to assert it here. If, on the other hand, by *manifestation* be merely meant the perception of a thing actually existing, then we shall be involved in the absurdity of admitting that jars, etc., also are eternal, etc."

SECT. IX.—Some further reasonings in support of the supernatural origin of the Veda, and distinction in point of authority between it and the Smṛitis or non-Vedic Śāstras as stated by the Commentators on the Taittirīya Yajur-veda, the Pūrva Mīmānsā, Manu, and the Vedānta, etc.; difference of opinion between Sankara and Madhusūdana regarding the orthodoxy of Kapila and Kanāda.

I.—The Nyāya-mālā-ristāra.—I shall begin this section with an extract on the supernatural origin of the Veda from the *Nyāya-mālā-ristara*, a summary of the doctrines of the Pūrva Mīmānsā of

⁴⁵ Literally, " the state of being not yet arrived at something " [?]

Jaimini, by Mādhaba Āchāryya, the brother of Sāyaṇa Āchāryya (see above, p. 40). Nyāya-malā-vistara i. 1, 25, 26 : *Paurusheyerāñ na rā veda-rākyāñ syāt paurusheyatā | Kāṭhakādi-samā-khyānād rākyatrāchchānya-rākyā-rat | Samākhyā 'dhyāpakatrena rākyateantu parāhatum | Tathkartranupalambhena syāt tato 'paurusheyatā || Kāṭhakañ Kauthumañ Taittiriyakam ityādi samākhyā tattad-veda-rishayā loke dṛishtā | taddhita-pratyayaś-cha tēna proktam ity asmin arthe varttate | tathā sati Vyāsena proktam Vaiyāsikam Bhāratam ity ādār ita paurusheyatram pratiyate | kiñcha | vimatum veda-rākyam paurusheyam | rākyateāt | Kālidāsādī-rākyā-rāditi prāpte brāmah | adhyayana-sampradāya-pravarttakatrena samākhyā upapadyate | Kālidāsādī-grantheshu tat-sargārasānc karītāra upalabhyante | tothā redasyāpi paurusheyatre tat-karītā upalabhyeta na cha upalabhyate | ato rākyatra-hetuh pratikāla-turka-parāhataḥ | tasmād apaurusheyo cedah | tathā sati purusha-buddhi-kṛitasya ṣprānāmṛgasya anāśayānīyatrād rādhīrākyasya dharme prāmānyāñ susthitam.⁴⁶*

“[Verses] ‘Is the word of the Veda of human origin or not? It must be human, since (1) it bears the names of Kāthaka, etc., and (2) has the characters of a sentence, like other sentences. No; for (1) the names arose from particular persons being *teachers* of the Vedas, and (2) the objection that the Vedic precepts have the characters of common sentences is refuted by other considerations. For the Veda must be supernatural, since it has never been known to have had a maker.’ [Comment] It is objected (1) that the names Kāthaka, Kauthuma, Taittiriyaka, etc., are applied in common usage to the different Vedas; and the *taddhita* affix by which these appellations are formed, denotes ‘uttered by’ [Kāṭha, Kuthumi, and Tittiri] (comp. Pānini iv. 3, 101). Such being the case, it is clear that these parts of the Vedas are of human origin [or derived from a person, *purusha*], like the

⁴⁶ I have extracted this passage from Prof. Goldstücker's unpublished text of the Nyāya-malā-vistara; and I am indebted to the same profound scholar for some assistance in my translation of it.

Mahābhārata, which is styled *Vaiyāsika*, because it was uttered by Vyāsa, etc. And further (2), the sentences of the Veda, being subject to different interpretations, are of human origin, because they have the properties of a sentencee, like the sentences of Kalidasa, etc. To this we reply (1), the name applied to any Veda originates in the fact that the sage whose name it bears, was an agent in transmitting the study of that Veda. But (2) in the books of Kālidāsa and others, the authors are discoverable [from the notices] at the end of each section. Now if the Veda also were of human composition, the author of it would, in like manner, be discoverable; but such is not the case. Hence, the objection that the Veda partakes of the nature of common sentences is refuted by opposing considerations. Consequently the Veda is superhuman. And such being the case, as we cannot suspect in it any fallibility occasioned by the defects of human reason, the preceptive texts of the Veda are demonstrated to be authoritative in questions of duty."

II.—*Vedārtha prakāśa*.—The verses just quoted are repeated in the *Vedārtha-prakāśa* of Mādhaba on the Taittirīya Sanhitā (p. 26), with a various reading at the beginning of the third line, viz., ‘*samākhyānam prarachanāt*’ instead of ‘*samākhyā dhyāpaka-trena*.’ The comment by which the verses are explained in the same work, is as follows:—*Vālmikīyaṁ Vaiyāsi-kīyam ityādi-samākhyānād Rāmāyaṇa-Bhāratādikāṁ yathā paurusheyaṁ tathā Kāṭhakaṁ Kauthumaṁ Taittirīyam ityādi-samākhyānād vedāḥ paurushyaḥ | kiñcha veda-rākyam paurushyaṁ rākyatcāt Kālidāsādi-rākyā-rād iti chet | maieam | sam-pradāya-pravṛittiā samākhyopapattih | Vākyatva-hetus tu anupalabdhi-viruddha-kālātyayāpadishṭah | Yathā Vyāsa-Vālmikī-prabhṛitayas tad-grantha-nirmāṇācasare kaiscid upalabdhiḥ | anyair apy avichhinna-sampradāyena upalabhyante | na tathā veda-karttā purushah kāścid upalabdhiḥ | pratyuta veda-asya nityatvam śruti-smṛitibhyām pūrvam udāhṛitam | Paramātmā tu veda-karttā ’pi na laukika-purushah | tasmāt karttri-doshābhāvād nāsty aprāmānya-śāṅkā. “It may be said (1) that*

as the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata, and other such books, are regarded as the works of men from the epithets *Vālmīkiya* (composed by Vālmīki), *Vaiyāsikīya* (composed by Vyāsa), etc., which they bear, so too the Veda must be of human origin, since it is called by the appellations of *Kāthaka*, *Kauthuma*, and *Taittirīya*, etc.; and further (2), that the word of the Veda must be human, because it possesses the properties of a common sentence. But these objections are unfounded, for (1) the appellation of any part of the Veda is derived from some sage who was an agent in transmitting the study of it; and (2) the objection about the Veda having the properties of a common sentence is opposed to the fact that no author was ever perceived, and is refuted by the length of time [during which the Veda has been received as superhuman]. For though Vyāsa and Vālmīki, etc., when employed in the composition of their respective works, were perceived by some persons to be so engaged, and are known by others also [in after ages] to be the authors, from the existence of an unbroken tradition to that effect;—no human author of the Veda has ever been perceived. On the contrary, we have formerly shown that the eternity of the Veda is declared both by itself and by the Smṛiti. And even if the supreme Spirit be the maker of it; still he is not a mundane person, and consequently, as no defect exists in the maker, there is no reason to suspect fallibility in his work."

I do not know how it has happened that these commentators have taken no notice of an obvious objection which may be raised to the validity of this reasoning, viz., that the hymns of the Rik and other Vedas are all set down in the Anukramanīs, or indices to those works, as being uttered by particular rishis; the rishis being, in fact, there defined as those whose words the hymns were—*yasya rākyam sa rishih*. (See Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 26, or p. 12 of W. and N.'s ed.) Though, however, this objection has not been noticed in any of the preceding passages, an answer has been provided to it in the well-known assertion of the orthodox Indian writers that the rishis did not

compose, but only *saw* the hymns and other parts of the Vedas, which had in reality pre-existed from eternity.

Thus, in the *Vedārtha-prakāsa* on the *Taittirīya Śāṅhitā*, p. 11, it is said : *Atīndriyārtha-drashṭāra ṛshayāḥ | Teshāṁ veda-drashṭṛtrīm smaryate | Yugānte 'ntarhitā⁴⁷ Vedān setihāśān maharshayāḥ | Lebhire tapasā pūrram anujñātāḥ scayambhurā.* (*Mahābhārata*, *Sāntiparva*, verse 7,660. See above, p. 73.) “The rishis were *seers* of things beyond the reach of the bodily senses. The fact of their *seeing* the Vedas is recorded in the *Śmrīti* : ‘The great rishis, empowered by *Svayambhū*, formerly obtained, through devotion, the Vedas and the *Itihāsas* which had disappeared at the end of the [preceding] Yuga.’”

So, too, *Mann* (as already quoted, Part First, p. 142) says, *Prajāpatiḥ idam śāstrum tapasavāsrijat prabhuh | Tathāica redān ṛshayas tapasā pratipedire.* “Prajāpati created this *Śāstra* (the Institutes of Manu) by devotion ; and by devotion the rishis obtained the Vedas.”

See also the passages from the *Nirukta* in pp. 174 ff. and 205 of the Second Part of this work.

A distinct line of demarcation is generally drawn by the more critical Indian writers between the Vedas and all other classes of Indian *Śāstras*, however designated. The former are considered to be infallible, and to possess an independent authority ; while the latter derive their authority from the Veda alone, and (in theory) are infallible guides only in so far as they coincide with the Veda. This will be clear from the following passages.

I.—*Nyāya-mālā-vistara*.—The first text which I will adduce has been already quoted in the Second Part of this work, but I shall repeat it here for facility of reference. It is from the *Nyāya-māla-vistara* i. 3, 24. *Baudhāyanāpastambāśvalāyana-kātyāyanādi-nāmāṇkitāḥ kalpasūtrādi-granthā nigama-nirukta-shadāṅga-granthā Manvādi-smṛitayaś cha apaurusheyāḥ | dharma-buddhi-janakatvāt | veda-vat | na cha mūla-pramāṇa-sāpex-*

⁴⁷ The text of the *Biblioth. Ind.* reads *tarki tān*. I have followed the *M. Bh.*, which evidently gives the true reading.

*atvena reda-vaishamyam iti śaṅkānīyam | utpannāyā buddhchē
 svataḥ-prāmānyāṇigīkāreṇa nīraperatrāt || Mairam | uktānu-
 mānasya kālātyayāpadishṭutrāt | Baudhāyana-sūtram Āpas-
 tamba-sūtram ity eram purusha-nannā te granthā uchyantc | na
 cha Kāṭhakādi-samākhyā-rat prarachana-nimittatram yuktam |
 tad-grantha-nirmāṇa-kāle tadānīntanaiḥ kaiścid upalabdhatrāt | tachcha arichhinna-pāramaparyena anurarttate | tataḥ Kāli-
 dāsōdi-grantha-rat paurushyāḥ | tathāpi reda-mūlatrāt pramā-
 nam || . . . kalpasya redatram nādyāpi siddham | kintu prayat-
 nena sādhanīyam | na cha tat sādhayitum śakyam | paurushe-
 yatrasya samākhyayā tat-karttut upalambhena cha sādhitatrāt.*

“ It may be said that the Kalpa Sūtras and other works designated by the names of Baudhāyana, Āpastamba, Aśvalayana, Kātyāyana, etc., and the Nigaina, Nirukta, and six Vedangas, together with the Smṛitis of Manu and others, are superhuman, because they impart a knowledge of duty, as the Vedas do ; and that they should not be suspected of inferiority to the Vedas on the ground that they depend upon a primary authority, since the knowledge which they impart is independent, because it is admitted to be self-evidencing. But this view is incorrect, for the inference in question is refuted by the length of time [during which these works have been recognized as human compositions]. The books in question are called by the names of men, as ‘ the Sūtras of Baudhāyana,’ ‘ the Sūtras of Āpastamba ;’ and these designations cannot correctly be said to originate in the oral transmission of the works by those teachers whose names they bear (as is really the case in regard to the Kāthaka and other parts of the Veda), for it was known to some of the contemporaries of these men, at the time when they were composing these Sūtras, Smṛitis, etc., that they were so engaged ; and this knowledge has descended by unbroken tradition. Hence the books in question are, like the works of Kālidasa and others, of human origin. Nevertheless, they possess authority, as being founded on the Veda.” . . . The following additional remarks represent the opinion of the Guru (Prabhākara) on the same

question : “ It is not yet proved that the Kalpa Sūtras possess the character of the Veda ; it would require great labour to prove it ; and, in fact, it is impossible to prove it. For the human origin of these books is established by the names which they bear, and by their being observed to have had authors.”

II.—*Kullūka*.—The same thing is admitted by Kullūka, the commentator on Manu, who (in his remarks on i. 1) thus defines the relation of his author to the Vedas : *Paurushcyatre’pi Mamuvākyānām arigīta-mahājana-parigrahāt śrutyupagrahāchcha veda-mūlakatayā prāmānyam | Tathā cha chhāndogya-brāhmaṇe śrūyate ‘Manur rai yat kiñcid aradat tad bheshajam bheshajatāyāḥ’ iti | Vṛihaspatir apy āha ‘Vedārthopanibandhyitrāt prādāhānyam hi Manoḥ smṛitam | Manrartha-riparītā tu yā smṛitiḥ sā na śasyate | Tārach chhāstrāṇī śobhante tarka-eyākarāṇāni cha | Dharmārtha-moropadeshtā Manur yāranna dṛiṣyate’ | Mahābhāratae ’py uktam ‘Purāṇam Mānava dharmāḥ sāṅgo vedaś chikitsitam | Ājñā-siddhānī chatvāri na hantaryānī hetubhīḥ’ | virodhi Bauddhādi-tarkair na hantaryānī | anukūlastu mīmāṁsādi-tarkāḥ prararttānya eva | ata eva rasyati ‘ārshaṁ dharmopadeśāncha veda-śastrāvirodhinā | yas tarkęyānusandhatte sa dharmān veda netarah’ iti.*

“ Though the Institutes of Manu had a human author, still, as their reception by illustrious men of unimpeached [orthodoxy], and their conformity to the Veda, prove that they are based upon the latter, they are authoritative. Accordingly it is recorded in the Chhāndogya Brahmana that, ‘ Whatever Manu said is a medicine of remedial efficacy.’ And Vṛihaspati says : ‘ As Manu expounds the sense of the Veda, he is traditionally celebrated as pre-eminent. But that *smṛiti* which is contrary to the sense of Manu, is not approved. Books [on law ?], logic, and grammar are all eclipsed as soon as Manu, our instructor in duty, and in the means of attaining both earthly prosperity, and final liberation, is beheld.’ And it is said in the Mahābhārata : ‘ The Puranas, the institutes of Manu, the Veda with its appendages, and treatises on medicine, these four, which are established by [divine] command,

are not to be assailed by rationalistic arguments ;' that is, they are not to be attacked by hostile reasonings, such as those of the Buddhists. But friendly arguments, such as those of the Mīmānsakas, are to be employed. And accordingly, we shall find below (Manu xii. 106) that he says, 'the man who investigates the injunctions of the rishis, and the rules of duty by reasoning which is agreeable to the Veda, he, and he only, is acquainted with duty.' " (See above, p. 13, note 10.)

III.—*Nyāya-mālā-vistara*.—But the precepts of the smṛiti are not considered useless or superfluous. On the contrary, an authority is attributed to them corresponding to the antiquity, elevated position, and sacred character of their authors. Thus the author of the Nyāya-mālā-vistara says (i. 3, 3) : *Vimatā smritir veda-mūlā | ravidha-manrādi-praṇita-smṛititecāt | upanayanādhyayanādi-smṛiti-rat | na cha raiyarthyaṁ śankarīyam | asmad-ādināṁ pratyaxeshu pāroveshu nānā redeshu riprakirṇasya amushtheyārthasya ekatra sañxipyamānatvāt.* “The variously understood smṛiti is founded on the Veda, because the traditions, such as those regarding investiture, study, etc., have been compiled by Vedic men, such as Manu and others. Nor is it to be surmised that the smṛiti is useless, since it throws together in a condensed form a variety of injunctions regarding matters to be observed, which are scattered through different Vedas, both such as are visible and such as are invisible to us.” (This last expression appears to refer to the supposition that some parts of the Veda which Manu and others had before them when compiling their own works, have now been lost. See Müller’s *Anc. Sans. Lit.* pp. 103-107.)

Accordingly the smṛitis have an authority superior to that founded merely on the practice of learned men of modern date derived from their own private study of the Vedas. Thus the Nyāya-mālā-vistara says (i. 3, 19) : *Na hi idānintanāḥ śishtāḥ Manv-ādi-rat deśa-kāla-riprakrishtām vedām dirya-jñāncna sāx-ātkarttuṇ śaknuvanti yena śishtāchārō mūla-vedam anumāpayet.* “For learned men of the present day do not possess the power,

which Manu and others had, of placing before their minds, through divine knowledge, the Veda which was far removed from them both in place and time, so as to justify us in regarding the practice of these moderns as a sufficient ground for inferring the existence of a Veda as its foundation."

But as learned men, in any particular country or at any particular time, may be able to consult some smṛiti which authorizes their particular observances, "these observances may serve as ground for inferring the existence of some smṛiti on which they are founded, but not for inferring a Veda: (*tasmāch chhishtā-chareṇa smṛitir anumātuṁ śakyate na tu śrutiḥ*). But a smṛiti which is thus merely inferred to exist is set aside by any visibly existing smṛiti of contrary import: (*anumitā cha smṛitir virud-dhayā pratyaxayā smṛityā bādhyate*)."

IV.—Śankara.—The above passages, by assuming that Manu and other eminent sages had the power of consulting Vedic texts now no longer accessible, make them practically almost infallible. The same view is taken by Śankara Āchāryya. (See, however, the passage quoted from him above, in note 31, p. 45.) In answer to the remark of a Mīmānsaka objector stated in the comment on the Brahna Sūtras i. 3, 32, that the Itihasas and Puranas, being of human origin, have only a derived and secondary authority ('*itihāsa-purānam api paurushyatrat pramāṇāntara-mūlatām ākāñxate*'), Śankara argues in his explanation of the following Sūtra (i. 3, 33) that they have an independent foundation: *Itihāsa-purānam api ryākhyātēna mārgenā sambharad mantrārtha-rāda-mūlatrāt prabhacati devatā-vigrahādi prapañchayitum | pratyaxa-mūlam api sambharati | bharati hi asmākam apratyaram api chirantanānām pratyaxam | tathā cha Vyāsādayo devatābhīḥ pratyaxam ryavaharantī smar-yate | yastu brūyād idānīntanānām iva pūrveshām api nāsti devādibhir ryavaharttum sāmarthyam iti sa jagad-caichitryam pratischedet | idānīm iva cha na anyadā 'pi sārvabhaumah xatriyo 'stīti brūyāt | tatascha rājasūyādi-chodanā uparundhyāt | idānīm iva cha kālāntare 'py aryavasthita-prāyān varṇāśrama-dhar-*

*mān pratijānīta tataścha ryarasthā-ridhāyi śāstram anarthakam
kuryāt | Tasmād dharmotharsha-rusāt chirantanā derādibhiḥ
pratyācañ ryajahrur iti ślishyate | api cha smaranti ‘scādhyā-
yādīshṭa-deratā-samprayoga’ ityādi | yogo ‘py aṇimādy-aīśvarya-
prāpti-phalakalī smaryamāno na śukyate sāhasa-mātrenā prat-
yākhyātum | śrutiścha yoga-māhātmyam pratyākhyāpayati |
‘prithey-ap-tejo-nila-khe samutthite pañchātmaka yoga-guṇe
prariitte | na tasyo rogo na jarā na mṛityuḥ prāptasya yogād
nimishām śariram’ iti | ṛishīnām api mantra-brāhmaṇa-darśi-
nām sāmarthyām na asmadīyena sāmarthyena upamātum yuk-
tam | tasmāt samūlam itihāsa-purāṇam.* “The Itihāsas and Puranas also, having originated in the way which has been explained, have power, as being based on the hymns and artha-vādas, to evince the corporeality, etc., of the gods. It is also reasonable to suppose that they are founded upon intuition. For there were things palpable through intuition to the ancients, though they are not thus palpable to us.⁴⁸ Accordingly it is recorded in the *smṛiti* that Vyāsa and others associated face to face with the gods.⁴⁹ Any man who should maintain that the ancients, like his own contemporaries, were destitute of power thus to associate with superhuman beings like the gods, would be denying all variety in the history of the world. Such a person would in like manner affirm that as now there is no kshatriya possessed of universal sovereignty, so neither was there ever such a prince; and would thus impugn the scriptural injunc-

⁴⁸ See Part Second, p. 174; see also Prof. Müller's article on the Vaiśeshika Philosophy in the Journal of the German Oriental Society, vol. vii. p. 311, where it is remarked that the Vaiśeshikas, like Kapila, include the intuition of rishis under the category of *pratyaya* (ārsham jñānam sūtra-kṛitī prithak na laxitam yogi-pratyaya 'ntarbhārūt).

⁴⁹ Compare Hesiod, fragment 119: ξυναὶ γὰρ τότε δάίτες ἔσαν, ξυναὶ δε θύωκοι ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι καταθήτοισ τ' ἀνθρώποις.

“Immortal gods, not unfamiliar, then
Their feasts and converse shared with mortal men.”

And Herodotus writes of the Egyptians, ii. 144: Τὸ δὲ πρότερον τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων θεοῖς ξυναὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἀιγύπτῳ ἄρχοντας, δικέοντας ἅμα τοῖσι ἀνθρώποισι “And [the Egyptian priests said] that before these men the gods were the rulers in Egypt, dwelling together with men.”

tions regarding the *rājasūya* sacrifice [which was only to be performed by a universal monarch]. He would also allege that in former times, as now, the duties of castes and of orders were scarcely at all in force, and would thus render fruitless the scriptures by which the rules relating to them are ordained. By these considerations it is intimated that the ancients, in consequence of their eminent holiness, were admitted to associate immediately with the gods, etc. And the *smṛiti* speaks of ‘contact with the gods made known by sacred study,’ etc. Again, when the *smṛiti* talks of devotion resulting in the acquisition of superhuman faculties such as minuteness, this assertion cannot have been made through mere audacity [*i.e.*, it must have had some good foundation]. The Veda, too, declares the immense power of devotion in these words : ‘ When the fivefold influence of devotion, arising in the elements of earth, water, fire, air, and ether, has begun to act, and a man has attained an ethereal [?] body, he is no longer affected by disease, decay, or death.’ And it is unreasonable to estimate by the analogy of our own power, the power of the rishis, the seers of the Vedic hymns and brahmanas. Wherefore the Itihāsas and Puranas have a foundation.’”

Sankara does not, however, treat all the ancients in this way. Like many other systematizers, he finds no difficulty in rejecting or explaining away any authorities which come into conflict with his views. It is thus that he deals with Kapila, the author of the Sāṅkhya. That eminent sage is thus spoken of in the Svetāśvatara Upanishad v. 2 : *Yo yoniṁ yonim adhitishṭhaty eko viśrāṇi rūpāṇi yonīścha sarrāḥ | rishim prasūtaṁ Kapilaṁ yas tam agre jñānair bibhartti jāyamañcha paśyct.* “The god who alone superintends every source of production and all forms, who formerly nourished with various knowledge his son the rishi Kapila, and beheld him at his birth.”⁶⁰

⁶⁰ See Sankara’s commentary on this passage in Bibl. Ind. vii. 351, and Dr. Röer’s translation, p. 62, with the note; also Dr. Hall’s note in pp. 18 and 19 of the preface to his edition of the Sāṅkhya Pravachana Bhāshya, in the Bibl. Ind.

In his comment on the Brâhma Sûtras ii. 1, 1, Sankara remarks on this passage of the Upanishad as follows:—*Yā tu śrutiḥ Kapilasya jñānātīśayuṁ darśayantī pradarśitā na tayā śruti-viruddham apि Kāpilam matam̄ śraddhātum̄ śākyam̄ Kāpilam iti śruti-sāmānya mātratād anyasya cha Kapilasya sagara-putrāṇām̄ prataptur | āsaderā-nāmnāḥ smarāṇāt | anyārtha-darśanasya cha prāpti-ratiisya āsūlhakatrāt | Bhavati cha anyā Manor māhātyam̄ prakhyāpayantī śrutiḥ ‘yad vai kiñcha Manur acudat tad bleshajam’ iti | Manunā cha ‘sareva-bhāteshu chātmānam̄ sarrā-bhātāni chātmāni | samam̄ paśyann ātma-yājī sārāyam adhigachchhati’ iti sarrātmatra-darśanam̄ prākūmṣatā Kāpilam matam̄ nindyate iti gamyate | Kapilo hi na sarrātmatra-darśanam̄ anumanyate ātmā bhātābhātāparipūrṇāt | . . . atoścha ātma-bheda-kalpanayā ‘pi Kāpilasya tantrasya ceda-viruddhatraṇām̄ vedānusāri-Manu-cachana-cirudhatriañcha na keralam̄ sra-tantra-prakṛiti-parikalpanayā creti siddham | “And the Vedic text which has been pointed out, showing the pre-eminence of Kapila’s knowledge, cannot be a warrant for believing the doctrine of Kapila, though contrary to the Veda, since the word Kapila has, in this text, a general sense [applicable to others besides the author of the Sāṅkhya], and another Kapila called Vāsudeva, the consumer of Sagara’s sons, also, is mentioned in the *smṛiti*; and since a darsana of a different import, devoid of benefit [?], has no power of proving anything. There is, besides, another text of the Veda which sets forth the eminent dignity of Manu in these terms, ‘ Whatever Manu said is medicine.’ And Manu,—when he employs the words, ‘ He who, with impartial eye, beholds himself in all beings, and all beings in himself, thus sacrificing his own personality, becomes identified with the self-refulgent Being;’ and, by saying this, commends the tenet that everything is one with the supreme Spirit—must be understood as censuring Kapila’s doctrine. For Kapila does not assent to the identity of Brâhma and the universe, for we know that he holds a diversity of souls.” (After quoting one passage from the Mahâbhârata, and another from the Veda, to*

prove that Kapila is wrong, Śankara proceeds): “ Hence it is proved that Kapila’s system is at variance with the Veda and with the words of Manu, who follows the Veda, not only in supposing an independent Prakriti (nature), but also in supposing a diversity of souls.”

IV.—See also Śankara’s commentary on the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, Bib. Ind. vii. pp. 136, 137, where he says : *Kāpila-kānādādi-tarka-sāstra-virodha iti chet | na | teshām mūlābhāre vedavirodhe cha bhrāntyopapattēḥ |* “ If it be objected that this is contrary to the rationalistic doctrines of Kapila and Kanāda [and therefore wrong], I answer no, since these doctrines are proved to be erroneous, as having no foundation, and as being in opposition to the Veda.”

V.—His remarks on a passage of the Praśna Upanishad are as follows, and afford a curious specimen of the contemptuous manner in which this orthodox Vedantist treats the heretical Sāṅkhyas, etc. (Praśna Up. vi. 4 ; Bib. Ind. viii. 244) :—*Sāṅkhyāstu avidyā-dhyāropitam era purushe kartṛitraṁ kriyā-kārakam phalañcha iti kalpayitvā āgama-rāhyatrāt punas tatas trasyantah paramārthata eva bhoktrītam purushasya ichchhanti | tatprāntarañcha pradhānam purushāt paramārtha-rastu-bhātām eva kalpayanto ‘nya-tārkika-krita-buddhi-vishayāḥ santo vikanyante | Tathā itare tārkikāḥ sāṅkhyair ity eram parasparsa-viruddhārtha-kalpanātā āmishārthina iva prāṇino ‘nyonyaṁ viruddhamānā artha-darśitvāt paramārtha-tattvāt taddūram eva apakrishyante | atas tunmatam anādritya vedāntārtha-tattvam ekaṭra-darśanam pratiādaravanto mumuxavāḥ syur iti tārkika-mate dosha-darśanam kiñcid uchyate ‘smābhīr na tu tārkika-tātparyyena |* “ The followers of the Sāṅkhya maintain that the functions of action, causation, and the enjoyment of reward become erroneously attributed to the soul (purusha) in consequence of supervening ignorance ; but as this doctrine differs from that of Scripture, they become afraid of it, and seek to ascribe to the soul enjoyment in the proper sense. And imagining another principle distinct from soul, viz., Pradhāna (or nature), which they regard as

substance in the proper sense, they become the objects of criticism by other rationalists, and are crushed. In consequence of these contradictory conceptions of the Sāṅkhyasts, other free-thinkers again begin to quarrel with them like animals [*dogs he would no doubt have liked to say*] fighting for flesh ; and thus, from their having some selfish object [?] in view, they are all drawn away to a distance from the essential truth. Wherefore let men, disregarding their tenets, seek for final liberation by paying honour to the principles of the Vedantic doctrine, which maintains the unity of all being. We have thus pointed out something of the errors of the rationalists, but without any reference to the rationalists personally.”

VI.—In thus depreciating Kapila, Śankara is in direct opposition to the Bhāgavata Purana (which, however, is considered to be a work of later date⁵¹), in which the author of the Sāṅkhya is spoken of with the greatest reverence. Thus in Bhāg. Pur. i. 3, 10, he is described as the fifth incarnation of Vishnu. *Pañchamah Kapilo nāma siddheśah kāla-viplutam | prorāchāsuraye sāṅkhyam tattva-grāma-vinirṇayam |* “ In his fifth manifestation, he [in the form of] Kapila, lord of saints, declared to Āsuri the Sāṅkhya which defines the collection of principles, and which had been lost through the lapse of time.”

VII.—And again, in Bhāg. Pur. ix. 8, 12, 13, Kapila is made the subject of eulogy. A legend narrates that the sixty thousand sons of King Sagara, conceiving Kapila to be the robber of a horse which had been carried away from their sacrifice, advanced to slay him, when they were burnt up by fire issuing from his body. The author of the Purana, however, denies that this was in any degree owing to *passion* on the part of the sage : *Na sādhu-vādo muni-kopa-bharjītā nrīpendra-putrā iti sattrā-dhāmani | katham tamo roshamayaṁ vibhāvyate jagat-pavitrātmani khe rajo bhuvaḥ | yasycritā sāṅkhyamayī dridheha naur yayā munuxus tarate duratyayam | bhavārvṇavam mrityupathaṁ vipaśchitah parātma-bhūtasya katham prithangmatih |* “ It is not an

⁵¹ See Wilson's Vish. Pur. pref. pp. xxviii. ff.

assertion befitting a good man to say that the king's sons were burnt up by the wrath of the sage : for how is it conceivable that the darkness (*tamas*) of anger should reside in the abode of goodness (*sattva*) and sanctifier of the world ; or that the dust (*rajas*) of the earth should ascend into the sky ? How could that sage by whom the strong ship of the Sāṅkhya was launched, on which the man seeking emancipation crosses the ocean of existence, hard to be traversed, and leading to death—how could he entertain the distinction of friend and foe [and so treat any one as an enemy]?"

It is not necessary for me to quote any further passages in praise of the author of the Sāṅkhya. There is a great deal about this system in the Mahābhārata, Śāntiparva, verses 11,037 ff. See Colebrooke's Essays i. 236 (p. 149 of W. and N.'s ed.) ; Wilson's Vishnu Purana, pref. pp. lix, lx, and text, pp. 9 ff. with notes ; Bhāgavata Purana iii. chapters 24-30 ; Weber's Ind. Stud. *passim* ; Dr. Röer's Introduction to Śvetāśvatara Upanishad, Bibl. Ind. xv. 35 ff. ; and Dr. Hall's Sāṅkhya Pravachana Bhāshya, Bibl. Ind. pref. pp. 5, note, 18, note.

We have thus seen that a distinct line of demarcation is drawn by the most accurate and critical of the Indian writers, between the *śruti*, which they define to be superhuman and independent, and the *smṛiti*, which they regard as of human origin, and dependent for its authority on its conformity with the *śruti*. Śankara, indeed, as we have also observed, goes very nearly so far as to assign an independent foundation to the *smṛitis* ; but he confines this distinction to such of these works as coincide in doctrine with the *śruti* or Veda, according to his own Vedantic interpretation of its principles, while all other speculators are denounced by him as heterodox. It is, however, clear from the Śvetāśvatara Upanishad, the Mahābhārata, the Bhagavad Gītā, the Vishnu, and the Bhāgavata Puranas, etc., that the doctrines of the Sāṅkhya must have been very prevalent in ancient times, and that Śankara, when he condemned them as erroneous, must have done so in the face of many powerful opponents.

It is not necessary for me here to inquire with any accuracy what the relation was in which the different philosophical systems stood to each other in former ages. It may suffice to say that the more philosophic adherents of each—of the Vedanta, the Sāṅkhya, the Nyāya, etc.—must, according to all appearance, have maintained their respective principles with the utmost earnestness and tenacity, and could not have admitted that any of the rival systems was superior to their own in any particular. It is impossible to study the Sūtras of the several schools, and come to any other conclusion. The more popular systems of the Puranas, on the other hand, blended various tenets of the different systems syncretically together. In modern times the superior orthodoxy of the Vedanta seems to be generally admitted. But even those who hold this opinion refuse to follow the example of Śankara in denouncing the founders of the rival schools as heretical. On the contrary, they regard them all as inspired Munis, who, by adapting their doctrines to the capacities or tendencies of different students, have paved the way for the ultimate reception of the Vedantic system. Such is the view taken in the Prasthāna-bheda of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, who thus writes (Weber's Indische Studien, i. 23): *Sareeshāñcha sañcēpēṇa triridhā eva prasthāna-bhedah | tatra ārambha-vādu ekah | parināma-cādo drittīyah | eicartta-rādas trītiyah | pārthivī-rāpya-taijasa-rāyavīyāś chaturridhāḥ paramāṇuṣo dcyāṇukādi-kramenā brahmāṇḍa-paryantāṁ jagad ārambhante | asad eva kāryyaṁ kāraka-ryāpārād utpadyate iti prathamas tārkikāñām mīmāṁsakānāñcha | sattrā-rajas-tamo-guṇātmakam pradhānam eva mahad-ahāñkārādi-kramenā jagad-ākārenā parināamate | pūrram api sūrma-rūpēṇa sad eva kāryaṁ kārana-ryāpāreṇa abhiryajyate iti drittīyah paxah Sāṅkhya-Yoga-Pātanjala-Pāśupatānām | Brahmanāḥ parināmo jagad iti Vaishṇavānām | sva-prakāśa-paramānandādrittīyam Brahma sra-māyā-vasād mithyāiva jagad-ākāreṇa kalpate iti trītiyah paxo Brahmarādinām | sareeshām prasthāna-karttrīyām munīnām eicartta-rāda-paryarasānena adrittīye Paramēśvare eva pratipādye*

*tātparyam | na hi te munayo bhrāntāḥ sarvaiñatrāt teshāṁ
kintu vahir-vishaya-pravaṇānām āpātataḥ purushārthe praveśo
na sambharati iti nāstikya-rāraṇāya taiḥ prakāra-bhedāḥ pra-
darśitāḥ | tatra teshāṁ tātparyam abuddhrā reda-riruddhe 'py
arthe tātparyam utprexamāṇas tan-matam eva upādeyatrena
gṛihṇantu janā nānā-patha-jushto bhavanti | iti sarram anārad-
yam |* “The difference in principle between these various schools
is, when briefly stated, three-fold. The first doctrine is that of
a commencement of the world; the second is that of an *evolu-
tion*; the third is that of an *illusion*. The first theory, that of
the logicians and Mīmānsakas, is this: atoms of four descrip-
tions—earthy, aqueous, igneous, and atmospheric—beginning
with compounds of two atoms, and ending in the egg of Brahma
(the world), originate the universe: and effects *previously non-
existing, come into being* from the action of a causer. The second
theory, that of the Sāṅkhias, Yogas, Pātanjalas, and Pāśupatas,
is that *Prudhāna* (or *Prakṛiti* = nature), consisting of the three
gunas (qualities), *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*, is *evolved*, through the
successive stages of *mahat* (intellect), and *ahankāra* (conscious-
ness), etc., in the form of the world; and that effects, which had
previously existed in a subtle form, are [merely] *manifested* by
the action of their cause. Another form of the theory of *evolu-
tion* is that of the Vaishnavas [the Rāmānujas], who hold the
universe to be an *evolution* of Brahma. The third view, that of
the Vedantists (Brahma-vādis) is, that Brahma, the self-resplen-
dent, the supremely happy, and the one sole essence, assumes, un-
reality, the form of the world through the influence of his own
illusion (*Māyā*).

*The ultimate scope of all the Munis, authors of these different
systems, is to support the theory of illusion, and their only de-
sign is to establish the existence of one Supreme God, the sole
essence; for these Munis could not be mistaken [as some of them
must have been, if they were not all of one opinion, or, as those
of them must have been who did not hold Vedantic principles],
since they were omniscient. But as they saw that men, addicted*

to the pursuit of external objects, could not all at once penetrate into the highest truth, they held out to them a variety of theories, in order that they might not fall into atheism. Misunderstanding the object which the Munis thus had in view, and representing that they even designed to propound doctrines contrary to the Vedas, men have come to regard the specific doctrines of these several schools with preference, and thus become adherents of a variety of systems. Thus all has been satisfactorily stated."

The view here taken by Madhusūdana of the ultimate coincidence in principle of all the different schools of Hindu philosophy, however mutually hostile in appearance, seems, as I have remarked, to be that which is commonly entertained by modern Pandits. (See Dr. Ballantyne's Synopsis of Science, advertisement, p. iv.) This system of compromise, however, is clearly a deviation from the older doctrine; and it practically abolishes the distinction in point of authority between the Vedas and the smṛitis, Darsānas, etc. For if the Munis, authors of the six Darsānas, were omniscient and infallible, they must stand on the same level with the Vedas, which can be nothing more.

To return, however, from this discussion regarding the hostility of Śankara to the adherents of the Sāṅkhya and other rationalistic schools, and the opinions of later authors concerning the founders of those several systems. The distinction drawn by the Indian commentators quoted in this section between the superhuman Veda and its human appendages, the Kalpa-sūtras, etc., as well as the smṛitis, is not borne out by the texts which I have cited above (pp. 7, 18) from the Vrihad Āranyaka, and Mundaka Upanishads. By classing together the Vedic Sanhitās, and the other works enumerated in the same passages, the authors of the Upanishads seem to place them all upon an equal footing. If the one set of works are superhuman, it may fairly be argued that the others are so likewise. According to the Mundaka Upanishad, neither of them (if we except only the Vedantas or Upanishads) can be placed in the highest rank, as they equally inculcate a science which is only of secondary importance.

As, however, Śankara, in his comment on the text from the Vṛihad Āranyaka Upanishad, maintains that the whole of the works enumerated, excepting the Sanhitās of the four Vedas, are in reality portions of the Brahmanas, it will be necessary to quote his remarks, which are as follows (Bibl. Ind. ii. 855 ff.) :

... Niśrasitam ira niścasitam | yathā aprayatnenaica puruṣha-niśrāso bharaty evam eā | are kiṁ tad niśrasitam tato jātam ity uchyate | Yad ṛigredo yajurredah sāmaredo 'tharrāṅgirasaś chaturvidham mantra-jātam | itihāsa ity Ěrvāśi-Purūravarasor sañvādādir 'Ērvāśi ha apsarā' ityādi brāhmaṇam era | purāṇam 'asad rā idam agre āśid' ityādi | ridyā devayana-ridyā 'redah so 'yam' ityādiḥ | upanishadah 'priyam ity etad upāśita' ityādyāḥ | ślokā 'brāhmaṇa-prabhava mantrās tad etc ślokā' ity ādayah | sātrāni castu-sangraha-rākyāni rede yathā 'ātmā ity era upāśita' ityādīni | anuyākhyānāni mantra-civaranāni | rākhyānāni arthaśādah | . . . evam ashtaridham brāhmaṇam | evam mantra-brāhmaṇayor era grahaṇam | niyatā-rachanārato ridyamānas�air redasya abhivyaktih purusha-niśrāsa-rat | nacha purusha-buddhi prayatna-pārcakah | atah pramāṇam nirapeku era srārthe | . . . tena redasya apramāṇyam āśāṅkate | tad-āśāṅkā-nicṛitti-artham idam uktam | purusha-niśrāsa-rad aprayatnotthitatrāt pramāṇam redo na yathā 'nyo grantha iti |

" 'His breathing' means, as it were his breathing, or it denotes the absence of effort, as in the case of a man's breathing. We are now told what that breathing was which was produced from him. It was the four classes of mantras (hymns), those of the Rik, Yajush, Sāman, and Atharvāṅgirases (Ātharvana); Itihāsa (or narrative), such as the dialogue between Ěrvāśi and Purūravas, viz., the passage in the Brahmana beginning ' Ěrvāśi the Apsaras,' etc. [Ś. P. Br. p. 855]; Purana, such as 'this was originally non-existent,' etc.; Vidyā (knowledge), the knowledge of the gods, as 'this is the Veda,' etc.; Upanishads, such as 'this is beloved, let him reverence it,' etc.; Ślokas, such as those here mentioned, 'the mantras are the sources of the Brahmanas, on which subject there are these ślokas,' etc.; Sūtras (aphorisms)

occurring in the Veda which condense the substance of doctrines, as ‘it is the soul, let him adore,’ etc.; *Anuvyākhyānas*, or interpretations of the mantras; *Vyakhyānas*, or explanatory remarks.” The commentator adds alternative explanations of the two last terms, and then proceeds: “Here, therefore, eight sorts of texts occurring in the Brahmanas are referred to; and consequently the passage before us embraces merely mantras and Brahmanas. The manifestation of the Veda, which already existed in a fixed form of composition, is compared to the breathing of a person: the Veda was not the result of effort proceeding from the conscious intelligence of any individual. Consequently, as proof in respect of itself, it is independent of everything else.”

Sankara terminates his comment on this passage by intimating that the author of the Upanishad means to remove a doubt regarding the authority of the Veda, arising apparently from its unreality, if it were regarded as created by a conscious effort of Brahma, and therefore as distinct from him, the only really existing being, and concludes that “the Veda, unlike all other books, is authoritative, because it was produced without any effort of will, like a man’s breathing.” (See *Sankhya Sūtras*, v. 50; above p. 83.)

This attempt to explain the whole of the eight classes of works enumerated in the Upanishad as nothing else than parts of the Brahmanas, cannot be regarded as altogether satisfactory, since some of them, such as the *Sūtras*, have always been referred to a distinct class of writings, which are regarded as uninspired (see Müller’s *Anc. Ind. Lit.* pp. 75, 86); and the *Itihāsas* and *Puranas* had in all probability become a distinct class of writings at the period when the Upanishad was composed. And Sankara’s explanation is rendered more improbable if we compare with this passage the other from the *Mundaka Upanishad*, i. 1, 5, already quoted above (p. 18), where it is said, “the inferior science consists of the *Rik*, *Yajush*, *Sāma*, and *Atharva Vedas*, accentuation (*sīrṣā*), ritual prescriptions (*kalpa*), grammar, commentary (*nirukta*),

prosody (*chhandas*), and astronomy.”⁶² Here various appendages of the Vedas, which later writers expressly distinguish from the Vedas themselves, and distinctly declare to have no superhuman authority, are yet mentioned in the same category with the four *Sanhitās*, or collections of the hymns, as constituting the inferior science (in opposition to the knowledge of the supreme Spirit). From this we may reasonably infer that the author of the *Vṛihad Āranyaka Upanishad* also, when he specifies the *Sūtras* and some of the other works which he enumerates, intended to speak of the *Vedangas* or appendages of the Vedas, and perhaps the *smṛitis* also, as being the breathing of Brahma. The works which in the passage from the *Mundaka* are called *Kalpa*, are also commonly designated as the *Kalpa Sūtras*.

This conclusion is in some degree confirmed by referring to the passage from the *Mahābhārata* S. P. 7,660, which has been cited in p. 73, where it is said that the “great rishis obtained by devotion the Vedas, and the *Itihāsas*, which had disappeared at the end of the preceding Yuga.” Whatever may be the sense of the word *Itihāsa* in a Vedic work, there can be no doubt that in the *Mahābhārata*, which is itself an *Itihāsa*, the word refers to that class of metrical histories. And in this text we see these *Itihāsas* placed on a footing of equality with the Vedas, and regarded as having been, like them, pre-existent and supernatural. See also the passage from the *Chhandogya Upanishad*,

⁶² I take the opportunity of introducing here Sāyana's remarks on this passage in his Commentary on the *Rig-veda*, vol. i., p. 33. *Atigambhirasya vedasya artham avabodhayitum sīxādīni shaḍ-angāni pravrittāni | atu era teshām apara-vidyā-rūpatvam Mundakopanishady Ātharvanikāt īmananti | 'dve vidye' ityādi | . . . sādhana-bhūta-dharma-jñāna-hetutvāt shaḍ-anga-sahitānām karma-kīndīnām apara-vidyāt-vam | parama-purushārtha-bhūta-brahma-jñāna-hetutvād upanishadānām para-vidyāt-vam.* “The *sīxā* and other six appendages are intended to promote the comprehension of the sense of the very deep *Veda*. Hence, in the *Mundaka Upanishad*, the followers of the *Atharva-veda* declare that these works belong to the class of inferior sciences, thus: ‘There are two sciences,’ etc. [see the entire passage in p. 18.] Since the sections of the *Veda* which relate to ceremonies [including, of course, the hymns], as well as the six appendages, lead to a knowledge of duty, which is an instrument [of something further], they are ranked as an inferior science. On the other hand the *Upanishads*, which conduct to a knowledge of Brahma, the supreme object of man, constitute the highest science.”

vii. 1, 1 ff. (Bibl. Ind., vol. iii., pp. 473 ff.) which will be given in the Appendix, where the Itihāsas and Puranas are spoken of as a *fifth Veda*. The same title is applied to them in the Bhāg. Pur. iii. 12, 39 : *Itihāsa-purāṇāni pañchamaṁ vedam Īśvaraḥ | sarvebhya eva mukhebhyaḥ sasrije sarva-durśanah |* “The omniscient Īśvara (God) created from all his mouths the Itihāsas and Puranas, as a *fifth Veda*.”

SECT. X.—Recapitulation of the Arguments urged in the Dāśanas, and by Commentators in support of the Authority of the Vedas, with some remarks on these reasonings.

As in the preceding sections (vi.-ix.) I have entered at some length into the arguments urged by the authors of the philosophical systems and their commentators, in proof of the eternity and infallibility of the Vedas, it may be convenient to recapitulate these reasonings, and to add such observations as the consideration of them may suggest.

The grounds on which the apologists of the Vedas rest their authority are briefly these :—First, it is urged that, like the sun, they shine by their own light, and evince an inherent power both of revealing their own perfection, and of elucidating all other things, past and future, great and small, near and remote (Sāyana, as quoted above, p. 44; Śankara on Brahma Sūtras i. 1, 3, above, p. 45, note 31; Sāṅkhya Sūtras, above, p. 84). Second, that they are not known to have had, and therefore could not have had, any human author, as the rishis merely *saw*, and did not *compose* them ; while, if they had any author, it was the deity, and as he is faultless, they could not have contracted any imperfection from being his work (Nyāyāmālā-vistara and Vedārtha-prakāśa, above, pp. 88 and 52). Third, that the language of which they are composed is eternal, and therefore they are eternal, and consequently (I presume) perfect

and infallible.⁵³ (*Mimamsa Sūtras* and commentary; *Brahma Sūtras* with Śankara's commentary; above, pp. 52-73.)

These arguments suggest a few remarks. In regard to the first ground for maintaining the infallibility of the Veda, viz., the evidence which radiates from itself, or its internal evidence, I need only observe that this is a species of proof which must be judged by the reason and conscience of each individual student. This evidence may appear conclusive to men in a certain stage of their national and personal culture, and especially to those who have been accustomed from their infancy to regard the Vedas with a hereditary veneration; whilst to persons in a different state of mental progress, and living under different influences, it will appear perfectly futile. It is quite clear that, even in India itself, there existed in former ages multitudes of learned and virtuous men who were unable to see the force of this argument, and who consequently rejected the authority of the Vedas. I allude of course to Buddha and his followers. (See also Part Second, p. 180 ff., where the objections of the rationalist Kautsa are detailed.)

In regard to the second argument, viz. that the Vedas must be of divine origin, as they are not known to have had any human author, I observe as follows. The Greek historian, Herodotus, remarks (ii. 23) of a geographer of his own day who explained the annual inundations of the river Nile by supposing its stream to be derived from an imaginary ocean flowing round the earth, which no one had ever seen, that *his opinion did not admit of confutation, because he carried the discussion back into the region of the unapparent* (*ἐς ἀφανὲς τὸν μῦθον ἀνεβάκας οὐκ ἔχει ἀλεγχον*). The same might be said of the Indian speculators, who argue that the Veda must have had a supernatural origin, because it was never observed to have had a human author like other books;—that by thus removing the

⁵³ In the *Vrihad Aranyaka Upanishad* (p. 688 of Dr. Roer's ed.) it is said: *Vāchaiva samrāṭ Brahma jñānyate rāg evai samrāṭ paramam Brahma.* “By speech, o monarch, Brahma is known. Speech is the supreme Brahma.”

negative grounds on which they rest their case into the unknown depths of antiquity, they do their utmost to place themselves beyond the reach of direct refutation. But it is to be observed (1) that, even if it were to be admitted that no human authors of the Vedas were remembered in later ages, this would prove nothing more than their antiquity, and that it would still be incumbent on their apologists to show that this circumstance necessarily involved their supernatural character; and (2) that, in point of fact, Indian tradition does point to certain rishis or bards as the authors of the Vedic hymns. It is true, indeed, as has been already noticed (p. 90), that these rishis are said to have only *seen* the hymns, which (it is alleged) were eternally pre-existent, and that they were not their authors. But as it appears to be shown by tradition that the hymns were uttered by such and such rishis, how is it *proved* that these rishis were not uttering the mere productions of their own minds? The whole character of these compositions, and the circumstances under which they appear to have arisen, are in harmony with the supposition that they were nothing more than the natural expression of the personal hopes and feelings of those ancient bards from whom they proceeded. In these songs the Arian sages celebrated the praises of their ancestral gods (while at the same time they sought to conciliate their goodwill by a variety of acceptable oblations), and besought of them all the blessings which men in general desire—health, wealth, long life, cattle, offspring, victory over their enemies, and in some cases also, forgiveness of sin and celestial felicity.

The scope of these hymns is well summed up in the passage which I have already quoted in Part Second, p. 206. “The rishis desiring [various] objects, hastened to the gods with metrical prayers.” The Nirukta, quoted in the same place, says: “Each particular hymn has for its deity the god to whom the rishi, seeking to obtain any object of desire which he longs for, addresses his prayer.”

And in the continuation of the same passage from the Nirukta (vii. 3), the fact that the hymns express the different feelings or

objects of the rishis is distinctly recognized :—*Paroxa-kritāḥ pratyaxa-kritāścha mantrā bhūyishṭhā alpaśā ādhyātmikāḥ | athāpi stutir eva bhavati na āśirvāda ‘Indrasya nu vīryāni pravocham’ iti yathā etasmin sūkte | athāpi āstir era na stutih ‘suchaxā aham axibhyām bhūyāsam sūcarchā mukhena susrūt karnābhyām bhūyāsam’ iti | tad etad bahulam ādhvaryave yājñeshu cha mantreshu | athāpi śapathābhīṣṭpau | ‘adyā mūriya’ ityādi... athāpi kasyachid bhārasya āchikhyāsā ‘na mṛityur āśid’ ityādi... | athāpi paridevanā kasmāchchid bhārāt | ‘sudero adya prapated anācrid’ ityādi | athāpi nindā-praśāṁse | ‘kevalāgho bhavati kevalādi’ ityādi | evam axa-sūkte dyūta-nindā cha kṛishi-praśāṁsā cha || evam uchchāvachair abhiprāyair ṛshīṇām mantra-dṛishtayo bharanti | “ [Of the three kinds of verses specified in the preceding section] those which address a god as absent, and those which address him as present, are the most numerous, while those which are addressed to the speaker himself [or the soul] are rare. It happens also that a god is praised without any blessing being invoked, as in the hymn (R. V. i. 32). ‘I declare the heroic deeds of Indra,’ etc. Again, blessings are invoked without any praise being offered, as in the words, ‘May I see well with my eyes, have a handsome face, and hear well with my ears.’ This frequently occurs in the Ādhvaryava (Yajur) Veda, and in the sacrificial formulae. Then again we find oaths and curses, as in the words, (R. V. vii. 104, 15), ‘May I die to-day, if I am a *yātudhāna*,’ etc. (See Part First, p. 132). Further, we observe the desire to describe some particular state of things, as in the verse (R. V. x. 129, 2) ‘Death was not then, nor immortality,’ etc. Then there is lamentation, as in the verse (R. V. x. 95, 14), ‘The beautiful god will disappear and never return,’ etc. Again, we have blame and praise, as in the words (R. V. x. 117, 6), ‘The man who eats alone, bears the blame alone,’ etc. So too in the hymn to dice (R. V. x. 34, 13), there is a censure upon dice, and a commendation of agriculture. *Thus the objects for which the hymns were seen by the rishis were very various.*”*

It is to be observed, however, that though in this passage the author, Yāska, speaks of the various desires which the rishis expressed in different hymns, he nevertheless adheres to the idea which was recognized in his age, and in which he doubtless participated, that the rishis *saw* the hymns.

I may also refer to the passage quoted from the Nirukta x. 42, in Part Second, pp. 391, 392, note, where the form of the metre in particular hymns appears to be ascribed to the peculiar genius of the rishi Paruchhēpa.

In Nirukta iii. 11 a similar manner of regarding the rishi Kutsa is ascribed to the interpreter Aupamanyava: *Rishih Kutso bhavati karttā stomānām ity Aupamanyarāḥ* | “‘Kutsa is the name of a rishi, a maker of hymns,’ as Aupamanyava thinks.”

I do not, as I have already intimated, quote these passages of the Nirukta to show that the author regarded the hymns as the ordinary productions of the rishis’ own minds, for this would be at variance with the expression “*seeing*,” which he applies to the mental act by which they were created. It appears also from the terms in which he speaks of the rishis in the passage (Nirukta i. 20) quoted in p. 174 of the Second Part, where they are described as having an intuitive insight into duty, that he placed them on a far higher level than the inferior men of later ages. But it is clear that Yāska recognizes the hymns as being applicable to the particular circumstances in which the rishis were placed, and as being the *bonâ fide* expression of their individual emotions and desires. (See also Nirukta ii. 10 and 24, quoted in Part First, pp. 143, 144, and 124.) But if this be true, the supposition that these hymns, *i.e.*, hymns suited to declare the different feelings and wishes of all the different rishis, were eternally pre-existent, and were perceived by them at the precise conjunctures when they were required to express their several aims, is perfectly gratuitous and unnecessary, (and involves what Indian logicians call a *gaurava*).

In regard to the third argument for the authority of the Vedas, viz., that they are eternal, because the words of which

they are composed are eternal, and because these words have an inherent and eternal (and not a merely conventional) connection with the significations or objects, or the *species* of objects, which they represent, it is to be observed that it is rejected both by the Nyāya and Sāṅkhya schools.⁵⁴ And I am unable (if I rightly comprehend this orthodox reasoning) to see how it proves the authority of the Veda more than that of any other book. If the words of the Veda are eternal, so must those of the Baudhāna books be eternal, and consequently the perfection and infallibility of these heretical works must be as much proved by this argument as the divine origin of the Vedas, whose pretensions they reject and oppose.

Against the eternity of the Vedas an objection has been raised, which Jaimini considers it necessary to notice, viz., that various historical personages are named in their pages, and that as these works could not have existed before the persons whose doings they record, they must have commenced to exist in time. This difficulty Jaimini attempts, as we have seen above (pp. 61, 63), to meet by explaining away the names of the historical personages in question. Thus Bahara Prāvahini is said to be nothing else than an appellation of the wind, which is eternal. And this method, it is said, is to be applied in all similar cases. Another of the passages mentioned by an objector (see above, p. 62) as referring to non-eternal objects is R. V. iii. 53, 14, "What are the cows doing among the Kikatas?" etc. The author of the Mīmānsa Sūtras would perhaps attempt to show that by these Kikatas we are to understand some eternally pre-existing beings. But Yāska, the author of the Nirukta, who had not been instructed in any such subtleties, speaks of the Kikatas as a non-Aryan nation. (Part Second, p. 362.) It is difficult to suppose that Jaimini—unless he was an enthusiast, and not the cool and acute reasoner he has commonly proved himself to be—could have seriously supposed that this

⁵⁴ See Dr. Ballantyne's remarks on this controversy, in pp. 186, 189, 191 and 192 of his "Christianity contrasted with Hindu Philosophy."

rule of interpretation could ever be generally received or carried out. The Brahmanas evidently intend to represent numerous occurrences which they narrate, as having actually taken place in time, and the actors in them as having been real historical personages. See, for instance, the two legends from the Śatapatha Brahmana, quoted in the Second Part of this work, pp. 324 and 419. And it is impossible to peruse the Vedic hymns without coming to the conclusion that they also record a multitude of events, which the writers believed to have been transacted by men on earth in former ages. (See the passages quoted from the Rig-veda in the First and Second Parts of this work, *passim*; those, for example, in Part Second, p. 208.)

We shall, no doubt, be assisted in arriving at a correct conclusion in regard to the real origin and character of the hymns of the Veda, if we enquire what opinion the rishis, by whom they were confessedly spoken, entertained of their own utterances; and this I propose to investigate in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II.

THE RISHIS, AND THEIR OPINIONS IN REGARD TO THE ORIGIN
OF THE VEDIC HYMNS.

I HAVE already shewn, in the preceding pages, as well as in Part Second of this work, that the hymns of the Rig-veda themselves supply us with numerous data by which we can judge of the circumstances to which they owed their origin, and of the manner in which they were created. We have seen that they were the natural product and expression of the particular state of society, of the peculiar religious conceptions, and of all those other influences, physical and moral, which prevailed at the period when they were composed, and acted upon the minds of their authors. (Part Second, pp. 205 ff; and above, pp. 109 ff.) We find in them ideas, a language, a spirit, and a colouring totally different from those which characterize the religious writings of the Hindus of a later era. They frequently discover to us the simple germs from which mythological legends current in subsequent ages were derived,—germs which in many cases were developed in so fanciful and extravagant a manner as to prove that the correct tradition had long before disappeared, and that the lost details have been replaced by pure fictions of the imagination. They afford us very distinct indications of the locality in which they were composed (Part Second, pp. 354-372); they shew us the Arian tribes living in a state of warfare with surrounding enemies (many of them, no doubt, alien in race and language), and gradually, as we may infer, forcing their way onward to the east and south (Part Second, pp. 374 ff., 384 ff., 414 ff.); they supply us with numerous specimens of the par-

ticular sorts of prayers, viz., for protection and victory, which men so circumstanced would naturally address to the gods whom they worshipped, as well as of those more common supplications which men in general offer up for the various blessings which constitute the sum of human welfare ; and they bring before us as the objects of existing veneration a class of deities (principally, if not exclusively, personifications of the elements, and of the powers either of nature, or of reason) who gradually lost their importance in the estimation of the later Indians, and made way for gods of a different description, invested with new attributes, and in many cases bearing new appellations.

These peculiarities of the hymns, combined with the archaic forms of the dialect in which they are composed, and the references which are made to them, as pre-existent, in the liturgical works by which they are expounded and applied, abundantly justify us in regarding them as the most ancient of all the Indian Scriptures,—as well as the natural product and the spontaneous representation of the ideas, feelings, and aspirations of the bards from whom they emanated.

We can also, as I have shewn, discover from the Vedic hymns themselves, that some of them were newer and others older, that they were the works of many successive generations of poets, that their composition probably extended over several centuries, and that in some places their authors represent them as being the productions of their own minds, while in other passages they appear to ascribe to their own words a certain divine character, or attribute their composition to some supernatural assistance. (Part Second, pp. 206 ff., 219 ff.)

I shall now proceed to adduce further proofs from the hymns of the Rig-veda in support of these last mentioned positions ; repeating, at the same time, for the sake of completeness, the texts which I have already cited in the Second Part.

SECT. I.—Passages from the *Hymns of the Veda* which distinguish between the Rishis as Ancient and Modern.

The appellations or epithets applied by the authors of the hymns to themselves, and to the sages who in former times had instituted, as well as to their contemporaries who continued to conduct, the different rites of divine worship, are the following : *rishi*, *kavi*, *medhārin*, *ripra*, *vipaśchit*, *vedhas*, *dirghaśruti*, *muni*, etc. The rishis are defined in Boehltingk and Roth's lexicon, to be persons "who, whether singly or in chorus, either on their own behalf or on behalf of others, invoked the gods in artificial language, and in song ;" and the word is said to denote especially "the priestly bards who made this art their profession." The word *kavi* means "wise," or "a poet," and has ordinarily the latter sense in modern Sanskrit. *Vipra* means "wise," and in later Sanskrit a "Brahman." *Medhārin* means "intelligent;" *vipaśchit* and *vedhas*, "wise" or "learned;" and *dirgha-śruti*, a "man who has heard much." *Muni* signifies in modern Sanskrit a "sage" or devotee." It is not much used in the Rig-veda, but occurs in viii. 17, 13 (Part Second, p. 397).

The following passages from the Rig-veda either expressly distinguish between contemporary rishis and those of a more ancient date, or, at any rate, make reference to the one or the other class. This recognition of a succession of rishis constitutes one of the *historical* elements in the Veda. It is an acknowledgment on the part of the rishis themselves that numerous persons had existed, and events occurred, anterior to their own age, and, consequently, *in time*; and it therefore refutes, by the testimony of the Veda itself, the assertion of Jaimini (above, pp. 60-63, and 112) that none but eternally pre-existing objects are mentioned in that book.

If, under this and other heads of my inquiry, I have cited a larger number of passages than might have appeared to be necessary, it has been done with the intention of showing that

abundant evidence of my various positions can be adduced from all parts of the Hymn-collection.

R. V. i. 1, 2.—*Agnih pūrvebhir ṛshibhir īdyo nūtanair uta | sa devān cha vaxati |* “Agni, who is worthy to be celebrated by former, as well as modern rishis, will bring the gods hither.”

The word *pūrvebhih* is explained by Sāyana thus: *Purātanair Bhrīg-angirah-prabhṛitibhir ṛshibhih |* “By the ancient rishis, Bhṛigu, Angiras,” etc.; and *nūtanaih* is interpreted by *idānīntanair asmābhīr api*, “by us of the present day also.”

R. V. i. 48, 14.—*Ye chid hi trām ṛshayah pūrve ūtaye juhāre ityādi |* “The former rishis who invoked thee for succour,” etc.

R. V. i. 80, 16.—*Yām Atharrā Manush pitā Dadhyāñ dhiyam atnata | tasmin brahmāni pūrrathā Indre ukthā samagmata ityādi |* “In the ceremony [or hymn] which Atharvan, or our father Manu, or Dadhyanch performed, the prayers and praises were, as of old, congregated in that Indra,” etc.

R. V. i. 118, 3 (repeated in R. V. iii. 58, 3).—. . . Āhur vīprāsaḥ Aśvinā purāyah | “O Aśvins, the ancient sages say,” etc.

R. V. i. 131, 6.—. . . Ā me asya vedhaso narīyasō manma śrudhi narīyasah | “Hear the hymn of me this modern sage, of this modern [sage].”

R. V. i. 139, 9.—*Dadhyāñ ha me janusham pūrro Angirah Priyamedhāḥ Kanro Atrīr Manur ridur ityādi |* “The ancient Dadhyanch, Angiras, Priyamedhas, Kanya, Atri, and Manu know my birth.”

R. V. i. 175, 6.—*Yathā pūrrebhyo jaritribhya Indra maya iva āpo na trishyate babhūtha | Tām anu tvā nividām johāvīmi ityādi |* “Indra, as thou hast been like a joy to former worshippers, like waters to the thirsty, I invoke thee again and again with this hymn,” etc.

R. V. iv. 20, 5.—*Vi yo rarapśe ṛshibhir narebhir vṛixo na pakvah sṛīnyo na jetā | . . . achhā virakmi puruhūtam Indram |* “I call upon that Indra, invoked by many, who, like a ripe tree, like a conqueror expert in arms, has been celebrated by recent rishis.”

R. V. iv. 50, 1.—*Tam pratnāsa rishayo dīdhyānāḥ puro viprā dadhire mandra-jīhvam* | “The ancient rishis, resplendent and sage, have placed in front of them Brīhaspati with gladdening tongue.”

R. V. v. 42, 6.—. . . *Na te pūrre Magharan na aparāso na vīryam nūtanāḥ kaśchana āpa* | “Neither the ancients nor later men, nor any modern man, has attained to [conceived] thy heroism, o Maghavan.”

R. V. x. 54, 3.—*Ke u nu te mahimanaḥ samasya asmat pūrve rishayo antam āpuḥ* | “Who among the rishis who were before us have attained to the end of all thy greatness?”

R. V. vi. 19, 4.—*Yathā chit pūrre jaritāra āsur anedyā anadvyā arishṭāḥ* | “As [Indra’s] former worshippers were, [may we be] blameless, irreproachable, and unharmed.”

R. V. vi. 21, 5.—*Idā hi te verishataḥ purājāḥ pratnāsa āsuḥ purukṛit sakhāyah* | *Ye madhyamāsa uta nūtanāsa utāramasya puruhūta bodhi* | “For here, o energetic god, the ancients born of old, have been the friends of thee, who didst often approach them; and so too were the men of the middle and later ages. O much-invoked, think of the most recent of all.”¹

R. V. vi. 21, 8.—*Sa tu śrudhi Indra nūtanasya brahmaṇyato vīra kārudhāyah* | “Heroic Indra, supporting the poet, listen to the modern [bard] who wishes to celebrate thee.”

R. V. vi. 22, 2.—*Tam u naḥ pūrre pitaro navagrāḥ sapta viprāsaḥ abhi rājayantah ityādi* | “Him (Indra) our ancient fathers, the seven sages, desiring food, celebrated, performing the nine-months’ rite,” etc.

R. V. vi. 50, 15.—*Erā napāto mama tasya dībhīr Bharadvājā abhyarchanti arkaiḥ* | “Thus do the Bharadvājas my grandsons adore thee with hymns and praises.”

R. V. vii. 18, 1.—*Tre ha yat pitaraś chid naḥ Indra viśvā vāmā jaritāro asanvann ityādi* | “Since, in thee, o Indra, our fathers, thy worshippers, attained all riches,” etc.

R. V. vii. 29, 4.—*Uto gha te purushyā id āsan eshām pūr-*

¹ This verse is translated in Benfey’s Glossary to the Sāma-veda, p. 76, col. i.

*reshām aśrinor ṛshīnām | adhā aham tvā Maghavan johavīmi
tvām nah Indra asi pramatih piteva |* “They were men who understood thy prowess : thou didst hear those former rishis. I invoke thee again and again, o Maghavan ; thou art to us wise as a father.” (The word *purushya* does not occur in any dictionary to which I have access. I have followed M. Langlois in giving the sense as above.)

R. V. vii. 53, 1.— . . . *Te chid hi pūrve karayo grinantah
puro mahī daśhīre deraputre |* “The ancient poets, celebrating their praises, have placed before them these two great [beings, heaven and earth] of whom the gods are the children.”

R. V. vii. 76, 4.—*Te id devānām sadhamālah āsann ritārānah
kavayah pūrryāsah | gūlhaṁ jyotiḥ pitaro anravindan satya-
mantrā cajanayann ushasam |* “They were the delight [?] of the gods, those ancient pious sages. Our fathers discovered the hidden light ; with true hymns they caused the dawn to arise.”

R. V. vii. 91, 1.—*Kuid aṅga namasā ye r̥idhāsaḥ purā
derāsaḥ anaradyāsa āsan | te Vāyave Manare bādhitāya avāsa-
yann² ushasam sūrycṇa |* “Those gods who formerly grew through reverence were altogether blameless. They caused the dawn to rise and the sun to shine for Vāyu and the afflicted Manu.” (Are we to understand *rishis* by the word *devāḥ* (gods) which is employed here?)

R. V. viii. 36, 7.—*Śyāvāśrasya sunratas tathā śrīnu yathā
aśrinor Atreh karmāṇi kṛinvatāḥ |* “Listen to Śyāvāśva pouring forth libations, in the same way as thou didst listen to Atri when he celebrated sacred rites.”

R. V. ix. 96, 11.—*Tvayā hi nah pitarah Soma pūrve karmāṇi
chakruḥ paramāna dhīrāḥ |* “For through thee, o pure Soma, our wise forefathers of old performed their sacred rites.”

R. V. ix. 110, 7.—*Tve Soma prathamā vrikta-varhisho mahe
vājāya śravase dhiyām dadhuḥ |* “The former [priests] having strewed the sacred grass, offered up a hymn to thee, o Soma, for great strength and food.”

² See Benfey's Glossary to Sāma-veda, under the word *ras* 2.

R. V. x. 14, 15 (== A. V. xviii. 2, 2).—*Idam nama ṛishibhyah pūrvajebhyah pāreebhyah pathikridbhyah* | “This reverence to the rishis, born of old, the ancients, who shewed us the road.” (This verse may also be employed to prove that at the end of the Vedic period the rishis had become objects of veneration.)

R. V. x. 56, 14.—*Vasishṭhāsah pitṛicad vācham akrata devān iḍānā ṛishirud* | *ityādi* | “The Vasishthas, like the forefathers, like the rishis, have uttered their voice, worshipping the gods.”

R. V. x. 96, 5.—*Trām aharyathā upastutāḥ pūrvebhir Indra harīśa yajrubbhiḥ* | “Indra, with golden hair, thou didst rejoice, when lauded by the ancient priests.”

R. V. x. 98, 9.—*Trām pūree ṛishayo gīrbhir āyan trām adhearseshu puruhātā risre* | “To thee the former rishis resorted with their hymns; to thee, thou much invoked, all men [resorted] at the sacrifices.”

Vājasaneyi Sambitā, xviii. 5, 2.—*Imau te parār ajarau patatrinau yābhyaṁ raxānsi apahañsi Agne* | *tābhyaṁ patema sukṛitām u lokān yatra ṛishayo jagmuh prathamajāḥ purāṇāḥ* | “But these undecaying, soaring pinions, with which, o Agni, thou slayest the Raxases,—with them let us ascend to the world of the righteous, whither the earliest-born ancient rishis have gone.” (This verse is quoted in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, ix. 4, 4, 4, p. 739.)

The ancient rishis, as Śāyana says in his note on R. V. i. 2, were Bhrigu, Angiras, and others whom he does not name. In another place we find Atharvan, Manu, Dadhyanch, and others mentioned. I will not attempt to give any critical account of these ancient sages. For some texts relating to Bhrigu, I may refer to the First Part of this work, p. 152 ff.; and some passages relating to Manu will be found in the Second Part, pp. 324-332. In regard to Atharvan, as well as Angiras, Prof. Goldstücker's Sanskrit and English Dictionary, and in regard to the same personages and Dadhyanch, the Sanskrit and German Lexicon of Boehltingk and Roth, may be consulted.

SECT. II.—*Passages from the Veda in which a distinction is drawn between the older and the more recent hymns.*

From the passages which I propose to bring forward in the present section, it will be found that the hymns which the rishis addressed to the gods are frequently spoken of as new, while others of ancient date are also sometimes mentioned. The rishis no doubt entertained the idea that the gods would be more highly gratified if their praises were celebrated in new, and perhaps more elaborate and beautiful compositions, than if older and possibly ruder, prayers had been repeated.

The fact that a hymn is called *new* by its author, does not, however, by any means enable us to determine its age relatively to that of other hymns in the collection, for this epithet of new is, as we shall see, applied to numerous compositions throughout the Veda; and even when a hymn is not designated as new, it may, nevertheless, be in reality of recent date, compared with the others by which it is surrounded. When, however, any rishi characterizes his own effusion as new, we are of course necessarily led to conclude that he was acquainted with many older songs of the same kind. The relative ages of the different hymns can only be settled by means of the internal evidence furnished by their dialect, style, metre, ideas, and general contents; and we may, no doubt, hope that much will by degrees be done by the researches of critical scholars towards such a chronological classification of the constituent portions of the Rig-veda.

The hymns, praises, or prayers uttered by the rishis are called by a great variety of names, such as *r̥īch*, *sāman*, *yajush*, *brahman*, *arka*, *uktha*, *sūkta*, *mantra*, *manman*, *mati*, *mañshā*, *sumati*, *dhū*, *dhūti*, *dhishanā*, *stoma*, *stuti*, *sushtuti*, *prasāsti*, *śāmṣa*, *gir*, *rāch*, *rachas*, *nītha*, *nīrid*, etc.

R. V. i. 12, 11.—*Sa nah starāna ābhara gāyatrena naviyasā | rayīm nīraraṭīm isham |* “Glorified by our newest hymn, do thou bring to us wealth and food with progeny.” (Śāvana

explains *nāvīyasā* by *pūrvakair apy asampāditena gāyatrena* | “A hymn not formed even by former rishis.”)

R. V. i. 27, 4.—*Imam ū shu tram asmākaṁ saniṁ gāyatram
navyāṁsam | Agne deveshu prarochah |* “Agni, thou hast announced [or do thou announce] among the gods this our offering, our newest hymn.”

R. V. i. 60, 3.—*Taṁ naryasī hrīda ā jāyamānam asmat-
sukīrttir mudhu-jihram aśyāḥ | yam ritijo vṛijane mānushāśaḥ
prayasvanta āyavo jījananta |* “May our newest laudation reach thee, the sweet tongued, who art produced from the heart, whom mortal priests the descendants of Manu, offering oblations, have generated in battle.”

R. V. i. 89, 3.—*Tān pūrrayā nividā hūmahe rayam Bhagam
Mitram Aditīm Daxam Asridham ityādi |* “We invoke with an ancient hymn Bhaga, Mitra, Aditi, Daxa, Asridh [or the friendly],” etc. (*Pūrvakālīnayā | nityayā | nividā | vedātmikayā vāchā |* “With an ancient—eternal, hymn—a Vedic text.” Sāyana.)

R. V. i. 96, 2.—*Sa pūrvayā nividā karyatā Āyor imāḥ prajā
ajanayad manūnām |* “Through the ancient laudatory hymn of Ayu he generated these children of the Manus.”

R. V. i. 130, 10.—*Sa no naryebhir ṛrishakarmann ukthais
purāṁ darttah pāyubhiḥ pāhi śagmaiḥ |* “Through our new hymns, do thou, showerer of favours, destroyer of cities, sustain us with invigorating blessings.”

R. V. i. 143, 1.—*Pra taryasīm naryasīm dhītim Agnaye vācho
matīm sahasaḥ sūnave bhare |* “I bring to Agni, the son of strength, a new and energetic hymn, a vocal celebration.”

R. V. ii. 17, 1.—*Tad asmai navayam Āngiras-vad archata
ityādi |* “Utter to him [Indra] that new [hymn] like the Angirases.” (“New, i.e., never before seen among other people.” *anyeshv adriṣṭa-pūrvam |* Sāyana.)

R. V. ii. 24, 1.—*Sa imām aviddhi prabhritīm ya iśishe | ayā
vidhema navayā mahā girā |* “Do thou who rulest receive this, our offering [of praise]: let us worship thee with this new and grand song.”

R. V. iii. 1, 20.—*Etā te Agne janimā sanāni pra pūrvyāya nūtanāni rocham* | “These ancient [and yet] new productions I have uttered to thee, Agni, who art ancient.” (Comp. R. V. viii. 84, 5, in the next section.)

R. V. iii. 32, 13.—*Yah stomebhir rāvridhe pūrrycbhir yo madhyamebhir uta nūtanebhīḥ* | “[Indra] who has grown through ancient, middle, and modern hymns.”

R. V. iii. 39, 1.—*Indram matir hrīda ā vachyamānā achhā patīm stoma-tushṭā jīgāti* | ā jāgrīrir vidathe śasyamānā Indra *yat te jāyate riddhi tasya* | 2. *divaścid ā pūrveyā jāyamānā vi jāgrīrir vidathe śasyamānā* | *bhadrā rastrāṇi arjuna rasānā sā iyam asme sanajā pitryā dhiḥ* | “1. The song, fabricated by the bard, and uttered from the heart, proceeds to Indra the lord ; it arouses him when chaunted at the sacrifice : be cognizant, Indra, of this [praise] which is produced for thee. 2. Produced before the dawn, arousing thee when chaunted at the sacrifice, clothed in beautiful and radiant garments,—this is our ancient ancestral hymn.” (*Pitryā* is rendered by Sāyana as *pitṛi-kramāgata*, “received by succession from our fathers.”)

R. V. iii. 62, 7.—*Iyāṁ te Pūshann āghriṇe sushtutir deva navyasi* | *asmābhīs tubhyaṁ śasyate* | “Divine and glowing Pūshan, this new laudation is uttered by us to thee.”

R. V. v. 42, 13.—*Pra sū mahe suśaraṇāya medhāṁ giram bhare naryasīm jāyamanām* | “I present to the mighty protector a mental production, a new utterance [now] springing up.”

R. V. v. 55, 8.—*Yat pūrveyam Maruto yachcha nūtanām yad udyate Vasavo yachcha śasyate* | *viśvasya tasya bhavathā navedasah* | “Be cognizant of all that is ancient, Maruts, and of all that is modern, of all that is spoken, Vasus, and of all that is sung.”

R. V. vi. 17, 13.— . . . *Suvīram trā svāyudham svajram ā brahma naryam avase varṣityāt* | “May the new prayer impel thee, the heroic, well-accoutred thunderer, to succour us.” (“New, i.e., never made before by others : prayer, i.e., the hymn made by us.”) *Nūtanam anyair akṛita-pūrram* | *brahma asmābhīḥ kṛitam stotram* | Sāyana.)

R. V. vi 22, 7.—*Tañ vo dhiyā naryasyā śavishṭham pratnam
pratnavat paritāṣṭayadhyai* | “I seek, like the ancients, to stimulate thee, the ancient, with a new hymn.”

R. V. vi. 34. 1.—*Sañcha tve jagmūr gira Indra pūrvīr vi cha
tvad yanti vibhvo manishāḥ* | *purā nūnañcha stutaya ṛshināṁ
paspridhre Indre adhi ukthārkāḥ* | “Many prayers, Indra, are collected in thee; numerous hymns issue forth from thee; both before and now the praises, texts and hymns of rishis have hastened emulously to Indra.”

R. V. vi. 44, 13.—*Yah pūrvyābhīr uta nūtanābhīr gīrbhīr
vāvṛidhe grīnatāṁ ṛshināṁ* | “He (Indra) who grew through the ancient and modern hymns of adoring rishis.” (See R. V. iii. 32, 13, above p. 123.)

R. V. vi. 48, 11.—*Ā sakhāyah subardughāñ dhenum ajadhvam
upa navyasā vachāḥ* | “Friends, bring hither the milch cow with a new hymn.”

R. V. vi. 49, 1.—*Stushe janañ suvratañ naryasibhīr gīrbhīr
Mitrāraruṇā sumnayantā* | “With new praises I celebrate the holy race, with Mitra and Varuna, the beneficent.” (“The holy race, i.e., the divine race, the company of the gods,” *sukarmāṇañ janañ dairyam janañ dera-saṅgam* | Sāyana.)

R. V. vi. 50, 6.—*Abhi tyāñ vīrañ girraṇasam archa Indram
brahmaṇā jaritar narena* | “Invoke, o worshipper, with a new hymn, the heroic Indra, who delights in praise.”

R. V. vi. 62, 4.—*Tā naryaso jaramāṇasya manma upa bhū-
shato yuyujānasapti ityādi* | 5. *Tā valgū dasrā puruśākatamā
pratnā navyasā vachasā virāse* | 4. “These (Aśvins), with yoked horses, approach the hymn of their new worshipper.” . . . 5. I adore with a new hymn these brilliant, ancient, and most mighty deliverers.”

R. V. vii. 53, 2.—*Pra pūrvaje pitarā navyasibhīr gīrbhīḥ
kṛṇudhvam sadane ḥitasya ityādi* | “In the place of sacrifice propitiate with new hymns the ancient, the parents,” etc.

R. V. vii. 56, 23.—*Bhūri chakra Marutah pitryāṇi ukthāṇi*

yā vah śasyante purā chit | “Ye have done great things, o Maruts, when our fathers' hymns were sung of old in your honour.”

R. V. vii. 59, 4.— . . . *abhi ra ārartt sumatir navīyasī ityādi |* “The new hymn has been directed to you.”

R. V. vii. 61, 6.— . . . *Pra vām manmāni richase navāni kritāni brahma jujushann imāni |* “May the new hymns made in your honour, may these prayers gratify you.”

R. V. vii. 93, 1.—*Śuchiṁ nu stomaṁ nara-jātam adya Indrāgnī Vṛittra-hanā jushetham | ubhā hi rām suharā johavīmi ityādi |* “Indra and Agni, slayers of Vṛittra, receive with favour the pure hymn newly produced to-day. For again and again do I invoke you who lend a willing ear,” etc.

R. V. viii. 5, 24.—*Tābhīr āyātām ūtibhir naryasībhīḥ susastibhir yad rām vrishṇvasū have |* “Come with those same succours, since I invoke you, bountiful [deities], with new praises.” (The epithet *naryasībhīḥ* in this text may possibly apply to the word *ūtibhīḥ*, “aids.”)

R. V. viii. 6, 11.—*Aham pratnena mannanā girah śumbhāmi Kanva-vat yena Indrah śushmam id dadhe |* “I decorate my praises with an ancient hymn, after the manner of Kanya, whereby Indra put on strength.”

R. V. viii. 6, 43.—*Imām su pūrryām dhiyam madhor ghritasya pipyushīnī Kanvā ukthena rāvridhuḥ |* “The Kanvas with their praises have augmented this ancient hymn, replenished with sweet butter.”

R. V. viii. 12, 10.—*Iyām te ritviyāvatī dhītir eti navīyasī saparyantī ityādi |* “This new and solemn hymn advances to honour thee,” etc.

R. V. viii. 20, 19.—*Yūnah ū su navishthayā vrishṇyah pāvakān abhi Sobhare girā | gāya ityādi |* “Celebrate, Sohhari, with a new hymn these youthful [gods] who shower down benefits and purify us.”

R. V. viii. 23, 14.—*Śrushṭī Agne navasya me stomasya vīra viśpate ri māyinas tapushā raxaso daha |* “Heroic Agni, lord

of the people, listening [?] to my new hymn, burn up with thy heat the deluding Raxases."

R. V. viii. 25, 24.—*Kaśāvantā riprā narishthayā matī maho rājināv arvantā sachā asanam* | "I have celebrated at once with a new hymn, these sage and mighty [princes], strong, swift, and carrying whips."

R. V. viii. 39, 6.—. . . *Agnir veda marttānām apichyam . . . Agnir dērā vyārṇute svāhuto naciyasā* | "Agni knows the secrets of mortals . . . Agni, invoked by a new [hymn], opens the doors."

R. V. viii. 40, 12.—*Eva Indrāgnibhyām pitrīrad naçīyo Māndhātrīrad Aṅgirasvad avāchi ityādi* | "Thus has a new [hymn] been uttered to Indra and Agni after the manner of our fathers, and of Māndhātri, and of Angiras."

R. V. viii. 41, 2.—*Tam ū shu samanā girā pitrīñāñcha man-mabhir Nābhākasya pruśastibhiḥ* | *yah sindhānām upa udaye sampa-srasā sa madhyamah* | "[Worship] him (Varuna) at once with a song, with the hymns of the fathers, and with the praises of Nābhāka. He who dwells at the birth-place of the streams, the lord of the seven sisters, abides in the centre." (This verse is quoted in the Nirukta x. 5. Nābhāka is said by Yāska to have been a rishi (*rishir Nābhāko babhūra*). A translation of the passage is given in Roth's Illustrations of the Nir. p. 135, where reference is also made to two verses of the preceding hymn (viii. 40, 4, 5), in which Nābhāka (the ancestor of Nābhāka) is mentioned thus: (verse 4) *Abhyarcha Nābhāka-vad Indragñi yajasā girā . . .* (verse 5) *Pra brahmāñi Nābhāka-vad Indrāgnibhyām irajyata* | "Worship Indra and Agni with sacrifice and hymn, like Nābhāka . . . Like Nābhāka, direct your prayers to Indra and Agni." In explanation of the seven sisters, Roth refers to Nir. v. 27 (R. V. viii. 58, 12) where the seven rivers are mentioned. See his Illustrations of Nir. pp. 70, 71.

R. V. viii. 44, 12.—*Agnih pratnena manmanā śumbhānas tan-tam svām kavīh viprena vavridhe* | "The wise Agni, illuminating

his own body at [the sound of] the sage and ancient hymn, has become augmented."

R. V. viii. 55, 11.—*Vayuñ gha te apūrryā Indra brahmāni
ṛyittrahan purutamāsaḥ puruhūta rājriro bhṛitiṁ na pra bharā-
masi* | “Indra, slayer of Vrittra, thunderer, invoked of many, we [thy] numerous [worshippers] bring to thee, as thy hire, hymns which never before existed.”

R. V. viii. 63, 7, 8.—*Iyañ te naryasi matir Agne adhāyi
usmad ā mandra sujātu sukrato amūra dasma atithe* | *sa te Agne
śantamā chanishtā bhavatu priyā tayā vardhasva sushtutah* | “O Agni, joyful, well-born, wise and wondrous guest, this new hymn has been offered to thee by us; may it be dear to thee, agreeable and pleasant: lauded by it, do thou increase.”

R. V. viii. 65, 5, 6.— . . . *Indrañ gībhīr harāmake* | *Indram
pratnena manmanā marutrāntam harāmake ityādi* | 12. (= S. V. ii. 340.) *Vācham ashtāpadim aham nacasraktim ritasprīsam* | *Indrāt pari tamram mame* | 5. “We invoke Indra with songs; we invoke Indra, attended by the Maruts, with an ancient hymn. . . . 12. I twine round the body of Indra a verse of eight syllables and nine lines, abounding in sacred truth.” (This verse is translated and explained by Professor Benfey, *Sāma-veda*, p. 255.)

R. V. ix. 9, 8.—*Nu naryase naryase sūktāya sādhaya
pathah* | *pratnarad rochaya ruchah* | “Prepare (o Soma) the paths for our newest, most recent, hymn; and, as of old, cause the lights to shine.”

R. V. ix. 42, 2.—*Esha pratnena manmanā devo devebhyah
pari* | *dhāraya* [qu. *dhārayā?*] *pavate sutah* | “This god, poured forth to the gods, with an ancient hymn, purifies with his stream.”

R. V. ix. 91, 5.—*Sa pratnavad naryase viśvavāra sūktāya
pathah kṛṇuhī prāchaḥ ityādi* | “O god, who possessest all good, make, as of old, forward paths for this new hymn.”

R. V. ix. 99, 4 (= S. V. ii. 983).—*Tañ gāthāya purānyā
punānam abhi anūshata* | *uto kripanta dhītayo devānām nāma*

bibhratih | “They praised the pure god with an ancient song ; and hymns embracing the names of the gods have supplicated him.” (Benfey translates the last clause differently.)

R. V. x. 4, 6.— . . . *Iyañ te Agne naryasi manishā ityādi* | “This is for thee, Agni, a new hymn,” etc.

R. V. x. 89, 3.—*Samānam asmāy anapāvrid archa xmayā divo asamam brahma naryam ityādi* | “Sing (to Indra) a new and unceasing hymn, worthy of him [?], and unequalled in earth or heaven [?].”

R. V. x. 91, 13.—*Imām pratnāya sushūtimī naviyasīm voche-yam asmāy usate śrinotu nah* | “I will address to this ancient [deity] my new praises, which he desires; may he listen to us.”

“R. V. x. 96, 11.— . . . *Naryañ naryañ haryasi manna nu priyam ityādi* | “Thou delightest in ever new hymns, which are dear to thee,” etc.

SECT. III.—*Passages of the Rig-veda, in which the rishis describe themselves as the composers of the hymns.*

In this section, I propose to quote, first of all, those passages in which the rishis distinctly speak of themselves as the authors of the hymns, and express no consciousness whatever of deriving assistance or inspiration from any supernatural source. I shall then adduce some further texts in which, though nothing is directly stated regarding the composition of the hymns, there is at the same time nothing which would lead the reader to imagine that the rishis looked upon them as anything else than the offspring of their own minds.

I shall arrange the quotations in which the rishis distinctly claim the authorship, according to the particular *verb* which is employed to express this idea. These verbs are (1) *kri*, “to make,” (2) *tax* (= the Greek *τεκτανομαί*), “to fabricate,” and (3) *jan*, “to beget, generate, or produce,” with others which are less explicit.

I.—I proceed to adduce the passages in which (1) the verb

kri, "to make," is applied to the composition of the hymns. (Compare R. V. vii. 66, 6, already quoted in the last section.)

R. V. i. 20, 1.—*Ayañ derāya jumane stomo riprebhīr āsayā | akāri ratna-dhātamah.* | "This hymn, conferring wealth, has been *made* to the divine race, by the sages, with their mouth [or in presence of the gods]."

R. V. i. 31, 18.—*Etena Agne brahmañā rārvidhasra śakti vāyat te chakrīma ridā rā |* "Grow, o Agni, by this prayer which we have *made* to thee through [or according to] our power, or our knowledge."

R. V. i. 61, 16.—*Erā te hariyojanā surrikī Indra brahmāni Gotamāsaḥ akran |* "Thus, o Indra, yoker of steeds, have the Gotamas made for thee pure [or beautiful] hymns."

R. V. i. 117, 25.—*Etāni cām Aśinā vīryāni pra pārryāni āyarak arochan | brahma kṛincanto vrishanā yurabhyām suvīrāso vidatham ā radema |* "These, your ancient exploits, o Aśvins, our fathers have declared. Let us, who are strong in bold men, *making* a hymn for you, o bountiful gods, utter our offering of praise."

R. V. ii. 39, 8.—*Etāni vām Aśrinā vardhanāni brahma stomām Gṛitsamadāsaḥ akran |* "These magnifying prayers, [this] hymn, o Aśvins, the Gṛitsamadas have *made* for you."

R. V. iii. 30, 20.—*Scaryarō matibhis tubhyām viprā Indrāya vāhah Kuśikāsaḥ akran |* "Seeking heaven, the sage Kuśikas have *made* a hymn with praises to thee, o Indra." (The word *vāhah* is stated by Śāyana to be == *stotra*, "a hymn.")

R. V. iv. 6, 11.—*Akāri brahma samidhāna tubhyam ityādi |*"O kindled [Agni], a prayer has been *made* to thee."

R. V. iv. 16, 20.—*Eved Indrāya vrishabhāya vrishnc brahma akarma Bhṛiyaro na ratham | . . . 21. Akāri te hariyo brahma navyām dhiyā syāma rathyāḥ sadāsaḥ |* "Thus have we *made* a prayer for Indra, the productive, the vigorous, as the Bhṛigus [fashioned] a car. . . . 21. A new prayer has been *made* for thee, o lord of steeds. May we, through our hymn (or rite) become possessed of chariots and perpetual wealth."

R. V. vii. 35, 14.—*Ādityā Rudrā Vasavo jushanta* (the Atharva-veda has *jushantām*) *idam brahma kriyamānañ naviyah | śrīnvantu no dīvyāḥ pārthivāśo gojātā ityādi |* “May the Adityas, Rudras, and Vasus receive with pleasure this new prayer which is being made. May the gods of the air, the earth, and the sky hear us.”

R. V. vii. 37, 4.—*Vayam nu te dāśvāṁsaḥ syāma brahma kriyvantaḥ ityādi |* “Let us offer oblations to thee, making prayers,” etc.

R. V. vii. 97, 9.—*Iyaṁ vām Brahmanaspate suryiktir brahma Indrāya vajrine akāri |* “Brahmanaspati, this pure hymn, [this] prayer has been made for thee, and for Indra, the thunderer.”

R. V. viii. 51, 4.—*Āyāki kriyavāma te Indra brahmāni vardhanā ityādi |* “Come, Indra: let us make prayers, which magnify thee,” etc.

R. V. x. 54, 6.— . . . *Adha priyam bhūsham Indrāya manma brahmakrito Vṛihadukthād avāchi |* “. . . An acceptable and honorific hymn has been uttered to Indra by Vṛihaduktha, maker of prayers.”

R. V. x. 101, 2.—*Mandrā kriyudhvam dhiya ā tanudhvam nāram aritra-paranīm kriyudhvam |* “Make hymns, prepare prayers, make a ship propelled by oars.”

It is possible that in some of these passages the verb *kri* may have merely the signification which the word *make* has in English when we speak of “making supplications,” etc., in which case it of course means to *offer up*, rather than to *compose*. But this cannot be the case in such passages as R. V. iv. 16, 20 (p. 129), where the rishi speaks of making the hymn as the Bhrigus made a chariot. And such an interpretation would be altogether inadmissible in the case of the texts which I next proceed to cite.

II.—Passages in which the word *tax*, “to fashion, or fabricate,” is applied to the composition of the hymns.

R. V. i. 62, 13.—*Sanāyate Gotamah Indra navyam ataxad*

brahma hariyojanāya ityādi | “ Nodhas, descendant of Gotama, fashioned this new hymn for [thee], Indra, who art of old, and who yokest thy steeds,” etc.

R. V. i. 130, 6.—*Imām te rāchaṁ easāyantah Āyaro rathaṁ na dhīrah sapā ataxishuh sumnāya tvāṁ ataxishuh* | “ Desiring wealth, men have *fashioned* for thee this hymn, as a skilful workman [fabricates] a car, and thus they have disposed (*lit.* fashioned) thee to (confer) happiness.”

R. V. i. 171, 2.—*Esha rāḥ stomo Maruto namascān hṛidā tashṭo manasā dhāyi devāḥ* | “ This reverential hymn, o divine Maruts, *fashioned* by the heart, has been presented by the mind [or, according to Sāyana, ‘let it be received by you with a favourable mind’].”

R. V. ii. 19, 8.—*Erā te Gritsamadah śūra manma urasyaro na vayunāni taxuh* | “ Thus, o hero, have the Gritsamadas, desiring succour, *fashioned* for thee a hymn, as men make roads.” (Sāyana explains *vayuna* by “ road; ” but it generally means knowledge.)

R. V. ii. 35, 2.—*Imām su asmai hṛidāḥ ā sutashtam mantraṁ vochema kvid asya vedat* | “ Let us address to him from the heart this *well-fashioned* hymn ; may he be aware of it.”

R. V. v. 2, 11.—*Etaṁ te stomaṁ turi-jātu vipro rathaṁ na dhīrah sapā ataxam* | “ I, a sage, have *fabricated* this hymn for thec, o powerful [deity], as a skilful workman fashions a car.”

R. V. v. 29, 15.—*Indra brahma kriyamānā jushasva yā te śarishk̄ha naryā akarma* | *vastreva bhadrā sukṛitā vasūyuh rathaṁ na dhīrah sapā ataxam* | “ O mighty Indra, regard with favour the prayers which are *made*, the new [prayers] which we have *made* for thee. Desirous of wealth, I have *fabri-cated* them like beautiful well-fashioned garments, as a skilful workman [constructs] a car.” (Compare R. V. iii. 39, 2; above, p. 123).

R. V. v. 73, 10.—*Imā brahmāṇi vardhanā Asvibhyāṁ santu śantamā* | *yā taxāma rathān iwa avochāma brihad namaḥ* |

" May these magnifying prayers which we have *fashioned*, like cars, be pleasing to the Aśvins : we have uttered great adoration."

R. V. vi. 32, 1 (= S. V. i. 322).—*Apūrryā purutamāni asmai mahe vīrāya tavase turāya | nirapsine rajrine sāntamāni vachāṁsi āsā sthavirāya taxam |* "To this great hero, vigorous, energetic, the adorable, unshaken thunderer, I have with my mouth *fabricated* copious and pleasing prayers, which had never before existed."

R. V. vi. 16, 47.—*Ā te Agne ṛichā harir hridā tashṭam bharāmasi |* "In this verse, Agni, we bring to thee an oblation *fabricated* by the heart." (Comp. R. V. iii. 39, 1, in p. 123.)

R. V. vii. 7, 6.—*Etc dyumnebhir viśram ātiranta mantram ye vā arām naryā ataxan |* "These men who have skilfully *fabricated* the hymn, have by their praises [?] augmented all [their possessions ?]."

R. V. vii. 64, 4.—*Yo vām garttam manasā taxad etam ūrddhām dhitīm kṛṇarad dhārayachcha |* "May he who with his mind *fashioned* for you (Mitra and Varuna) this car, make and sustain the lofty hymn." (The same expression *ūrddhām dhitīm* occurs in R. V. i. 119, 2.)

R. V. viii. 6, 33.—*Uta brahmānyā rayaṁ tubhyam pravriddha vajrivo vīprā ataxma jīrase |* "O mighty thunderer, we, who are sage, have *fabricated* prayers [or ceremonies] for thee, that we may live." (I take *brahmānyā* for the neuter plural, as it has no *visarga* in my copy of the R. V.)

R. V. x. 39, 14.—*Etaṁ vām stomam Aśrinā akarma ataxāma Bhṛigavo na ratham | ni amṛixāma yoshaṇām na maryye nityām na sūnum tanayaṁ dadhānāḥ |* "This hymn, Asvins, we have made for you; we have *fabricated* it as the Bhrigus [constructed] a car [or we have, like the Bhrigus, *fabricated* a car]; we have decorated it, as a bride for her husband, continuing the series [of our praises] like an unbroken line of descendants."

(The following is Sāyana's comment on this passage, for a copy of which I am indebted to Professor Müller: *He Aśrināu*

vām yuvayor etañ yathoktañ stomam̄ stotram akarma akurma |
 · Tad etad āha | Bhrigavo na Bhrigava ina ratham ataxāma
 vayañ stotram sañskritavantaḥ | karma-yogād Rihavo Bhriga-
 vah uchyante | athavā rathakārā Bhrigavah | kiñcha vayam̄
 nityam̄ sāśratum̄ tanayam̄ yāgālinam̄ karmaṇām̄ tanitārañ
 sūnum̄ na aurasam̄ putram̄ ita stotram̄ dadhānā dhārayanto
 martye manushye nyamrixāma yucayoh stutiñ uitarām̄ sañskri-
 avantah | “Aśvins, we have made this preceding hymn or
 praise of you. He explains this. Like the Bhrigus, we have
 made a car, we have carefully constructed a hymn. The Ribhus
 are, from this work being ascribed to them [?], styled Bhrigus ;
 or bhrigus are chariot makers. Moreover, maintaining this
 praise as a constant perpetuator (like a legitimate son) of sacri-
 fice and other rites, we have polished, i.e., carefully composed a
 celebration of you among men [?]”. (In this comment the word
yoshaṇā is left unexplained. In verse 12 of this hymn the
 Aśvins are supplicated *to come in a car fleetier than thought,*
constructed for them by the Ribhus :—ā tena yātam manaso
jātiyasa rathañ yañ vām Rihavaś chakrur Aśvinā |)

R. V. x. 80, 7.—*Agnaye brahma Rihavus tataxuh* | “The
 Ribhus [or the wise] fabricated a hymn for Agni.”

III.—I next quote some texts in which the hymns are spoken of
 as being generated by the rishis. (Comp. R. V. vii. 93, 1, in p. 125.)

R. V. iii. 2. 1.—*Vaiśvānarāya dhishayām ṛtāṛyidhe ghritam̄*
na pūtam Agnaye janāmasi | “We generate a hymn, like pure
 butter, for Agni Vaiśvānara, who promotes our sacred rites.”

R. V. vii. 15, 4.—*Navāñ mu stomam Agnaye divaḥ śyenāya*
jījanam | vasrah kuvid vanāti nah | “I have generated a new
 hymn to Agni, the falcon of the sky ; who bestows on us wealth
 in abundance.”

R. V. vii. 22, 9.—*Ic cha pūrve ṛishayo ye cha nātnāḥ Indra*
brahmāni janayanta viprah | “Indra, the wise rishis, both
 ancient and modern, have generated prayers.”

R. V. vii. 26, 1.—*Na somah Indram asuto mamāda na*
abrahmāno maghavānam̄ sutāsaḥ | *tasmāy ukthañ janaye yaj*

jujoshad nrivad naviyah śrinavad yathā nah | “The soma cheers not Indra unless it be poured out; nor do libations [gratify] Maghavan when offered without a priest. To him I generate a hymn such as may please him, that, after the manner of men, he may hear our new [song].”

R. V. vii. 31, 11.—. . . *Suvṛktim Indrāya brahma janayanta
riprāḥ |* “The sages generated a pure hymn and a prayer for Indra.”

R. V. vii. 94, 1, 2 (= S. V. ii. 266).—*Iyām vām asya man-*
manah Indrāgnī pūrvya-stutir abhrād vrishṭir iwa ajani |
śrinutam jaritur havam ityādi | “The excellent praise of this hymn [or the excellent hymn of this sage] has been generated [or, has sprung] for you, Indra and Agni, like rain from a cloud. Hear the invocation of your worshipper,” etc. (Benfey thinks *manman*, “spirit,” is to be understood of Soma, whose hymn, *i.e.*, the sound of his dropping, resembles the falling of rain. The scholiast of the S. V. makes *manman* = *stotri*, “worshipper”).

R. V. viii. 43, 2.—*Asmai te pratharyate Jātaredo richarshane
Agne janāmi sushtutim |* “Wise Agni Jātavedas, I generate a hymn for thee, who receivest it with favour.”

R. V. viii. 77, 4.—*Ā trā ayam arka utaye rararttati yam*
Gotamā ajijanan | “This hymn which the Gotamas have generated, incites thee to succour us.”

R. V. viii. 84, 4, 5.—*Śrudhi havaṁ Tiraśchyōḥ Indra yas trā
saparyati suvīryasya gomato rāyah pūrdhi mahān asi |* *Indra*
yas te narīyasīṁ giram mandrām ajijanat chikitein-manasam
dhiyam pratnām ritasya pipyushkīm | “Hear, Indra, the invocation of Tiraśchī, thy worshipper; replenish him with wealth in strong men and in cattle, for thou art great. Indra [do this for him] who has generated for thee a new and exhilarating hymn, springing from an intelligent mind, an ancient mental product, full of sacred truth.”

(These verses occur also in the Sāma-veda ii. 233, 234, and are translated by Professor Benfey, at pp. 230, and 250, of his edition. The hymn referred to in this passage is apparently

designated as both new and old. How can it be both? It may have been an old hymn re-written and embellished; ancient in substance, though new in expression. Compare St. John's Gospel, xiii. 34, and the First Epistle of St. John, ii. 7, 8, and iii. 11.)

R. V. ix. 73, 2.— . . . *madhor dhārābhīr janayanto arkam it priyām Indrasya tanvam avivṛidhan* | “Together with the honied streams, generating the hymn, they have augmented the beloved body of Indra.”

R. V. ix. 95, 1 (= S. V. i. 530).— . . . *ato matīr janayata svadhābhīḥ* | “Wherfore generate hymns with the oblations.” (Professor Benfey makes *janayata* the 3rd person singular of the imperfect middle, and applies it to Soma).

R. V. x. 7, 2.—*Imā Agne matayas tubhyam jātāḥ yobhīr aśvair abhi grīnanti rādhāḥ* | “These hymns, Agni, generated for thee, supplicate [?] wealth with [or celebrate thy wealth in] cows and horses.”

R. V. x. 23, 5, 6, 7.—*Yo rāchā ricācho mṛidhravāchah purū sahasrā aśicā jaghāna* | *Tuś tad id asya paumṣyaṁ grīnīmasi pitā iva yas tarishīm vāvridhe śārah* | *stomaṁ te Indra Vimadā ajījanann apūrvyam purutamaṁ sudānare* | *Vidmā hi asya bhojanam inasya yad ā paśūm na gopāḥ karāmahe* | *mā kir nah enā sakhyā riyaushus tara cha Indra Vimadasya cha rishek* | *Vidmā hi te pramatiñ deva jāmi-vad asme te santu sakhyā śivāni* | “Who (Indra) with his voice slew many thousand of the wicked uttering confused and hostile cries. We laud his several acts of valour, who, like a father, augmented [?] our vigour and our strength. For thee, o Indra, who art bountiful, the Vimadas have generated a copious hymn, which never before existed (*apūrvya*); for we know what is gratifying to this our master; and we collect it together, as a cowherd assembles his cattle. Indra, may that friendship of ours never be dissolved, which exists between thee and the rishi Vimada: for we know thy wisdom, o god; may thy friendship be favourable to us, like that of a kinsman.”

R. V. x. 67, 1.—*Imāñ dhiyañ saptasirshnīm pitā nah ritaprajātām brihatīm avindat | turiyam̄ svij janayad riśrajanyo Ayāsyā uktham Indrāya śansan |* “Our father hath discovered [or invented] this great, seven-headed hymn, born of sacred truth; Ayāsyā, friend of all men, celebrating Indra, has generated the fourth song of praise.” (In his Lexicon, Roth gives Ayāsyā as a proper name; but says it may also be an adjective with the sense of “unwearied.”)

R. V. x. 91, 14.—*Kilāla-pe soma-prishṭāya vedhase hrīdā matīm janaye chārum Agnaye |* “With my heart I generate a beautiful hymn for Agni, the drinker of nectar, the soma-sprinkled, the wise.” (See also R. V. i. 109, 1, 2, which will be quoted below.)

IV.—In the following texts the verbal root *ri*, “to move, send forth,” etc., used with or without a preposition, is applied to the utterance or (it may even mean) the production of hymns.

R. V. i. 116, 1.—*Nāsatyābhyañ bahrīr ira prariñje stomañ iyarmi abhriyā ira rātah | yār arbhañgāya Vimadāya jāyām scnājurā ni uhatuh rathena |* “In like manner as I spread the sacrificial grass to the Nāsatyas (Aśvins), so do I send forth to them hymns, as the wind [drives] the clouds; to them (I say), who bore off to the youthful Vimada his bride in a chariot which outstripped the enemy’s host.”

R. V. vii. 61, 2.—*Pra rām̄ sa Mitrā-Varuṇau ritārā vipro manmāni dirgha-śrud iyartti | Yasya brahmāṇi sukratū arāthah ā yat kratā na śaradah priñaithe [?] |* “The devout sage, deeply versed in sacred lore, sends forth his hymns to you, o Mitra and Varuna. You, mighty gods, receive his prayers with favour, since ye fill [prolong?], as it seems, his autumns by your power.”

R. V. viii. 12, 31.—*Imāñ te Indra sushtutim̄ viproh iyartti dhūtibhiḥ | jāmim̄ padā ira pipratim̄ pra adhware |* “The sage, with praises, sends forth to thee this hymn, which like a sister follows [?] thy steps in the sacrifice.”

R. V. viii. 13, 26.— . . . *Ritād iyarmi te dhiyam manoyujam |*

"... From the sacred ceremony I send forth a prayer, issuing from my mind [or, which will reach thy heart ?]"

R. V. x. 116, 9.—*Pra Indrāgnibhyām suvachasyām iyarmi sindhār iva prerayaṁ nāram arkaiḥ* | "I send forth a [hymn] with beautiful words to Indra and Agni; with my praises I have, as it were, launched a ship on the sea."

(Compare R. V. ii. 42, 1, spoken of Indra in the form of the bird called kapinjala, a sort of partridge: *Iyartti rācham ariteva nāvam* | "It sends forth a voice, as a rower propels a boat." See also R. V. x. 101, 2, quoted above, p. 130.)

V.—In the following passages, other verbs are employed to denote the composition or presentation of hymns.

R. V. i. 61, 2.—*Indrāya hṛidā manasā manīshā pratnāya patye dhiyo marjayanta* | "To Indra, the ancient lord, they prepared [or polished] hymns [or ceremonies] with the heart, mind, and understanding."

R. V. i. 61, 4.—*Asmai id u stomaṁ sañhinomi ratham na tashṭā iva tat-sināya ityādi* | "To him (Indra) I send forth a hymn, as a carpenter a car, for his food," etc.

R. V. i. 94, 1 (= S. V. i. 66).—*Imām stomaṁ arhate Jātave-dase ratham iva sam mahemā manīshayā bhadrā hi nah prama-tir asya saṁsadi Agne sakhye mā rishāmā rayam tata* | "Let us with our intellects decorate this hymn for the adorable Jātavedas like a car, for his wisdom is favourable to us in the assembly. Agni, in thy friendship may we never suffer." (The root *mah* means to honour or worship. I have partly followed Benfey's translation.)

There is to be found in the hymns a great multitude of passages in which the rishi speaks of presenting his hymns and prayers to the various deities who are the objects of his worship, without directly claiming for himself the authorship of those compositions. The natural inference to be drawn from the expressions which we shall find to be employed in most of the cases to which I refer, would, I think, be that the personality of the rishi himself was uppermost in his mind, and that he was

not conscious that the praises which he was uttering to the gods proceeded from any other source than his own unaided faculties. Of this description are the following texts, which represent a manner of thinking and speaking very prevalent in the hymns.

R. V. i. 60, 5.—*Tam tvā vayam patim Agne rayinām prasamsāmo matibhir Gotamāsah* | “We, the Gotamas, praise with hymns thee, Agni, the lord of riches.”

R. V. i. 77, 5.—*Eva Agnir Gotamebhir ritārā viprebbhir astoshta jātaredah* | “Thus has the holy Agni Jātavedas been celebrated by the sage Gotamas.”

R. V. i. 78, 5.—*Acochāma Rahūganā Agnaye madhumad vachah* | *dyumnair abhi pra uonumah* | “We, the Rahūganas, have uttered to Agni a honied speech; we laud him with eulogies.”

R. V. i. 91, 11.—*Soma gīrbhis tvā rayaṁ vardhayāmo racho-vidah* | *sumṛiñko na āriśa* | “Soma, we who are skilled in speech magnify thee with praises; do thou enter into us, bringing joy.”

R. V. i. 102, 1.—*Imām te dhiyam prabhare maho mahīm asya stotre dhishanā yat te ānaje* | “I present to thee, the great (god) this great hymn, because thy understanding has taken pleasure in my praises.”

(Sāyana renders *prabhare* by *prakarshena sampādayāmi* | “I carefully make or accomplish.” Roth renders *ānaje* “has been honoured.” See his Lexicon, under the word *añj*.)

R. V. i. 183, 6.—*Atārisha tamasas pāram asya prati vāṁ stomo Aśeināv adhāyi* | “We have crossed over this darkness; a hymn, o Aśvins, has been addressed to you.”

R. V. iv. 3, 16.—*Etā risvā ridushe tubhyañ vedho nīthāni Agne nīnyā rachān̄si* | *nivachanā kavaye kāryāni aśāñsisham matibhir viprah ukthaiḥ* | “Prudent Agni, to thee, who art wise, [have I uttered] all these songs and mysterious words; to thee, who art a bard, have I, a sage, uttered these hymns, these poems, with meditations and praises.”

R. V. iv. 32, 12.—*Arir̄yidhanta Gotamā Indra tre stoma-rā-*

hasah | “The Gotamas, Indra, bringing hymns to thee, have magnified thee.”

R. V. v. 11, 5.—*Tubhya idam Agne madhumattamañ vachas tubham maniṣhā iyam astu śañ hr̥ide | Trāñ girak sindhum iwa avanīr mahīr ā priyanti śarasā vardhayanti cha |* “Agni, may this sweetest of prayers, may this hymn (mental production) be pleasant to thy heart. As great rivers fill the ocean, so do the words of praise fill thee, and augment thee with strength.”

R. V. v. 22, 4.—*Agne chikiddhi asya nañ idañ vachah suhasya | Tañ tvā sūśipra dampate stomair vardhanti Atrayo g̥irbhīh śumbhanti Atrayah |* “Vigorous Agni, know these our words ; thee, with the beautiful nose, the lord of the house, the Atris magnify with praises, the Atris decorate with hymns.”

R. V. v. 45, 4.—*Sūktebhir eo rachobhīr derajushtair Indrā nu Agnī arasc huvadhyai | ukthebhir hi sma karayah suyajñā ārivāsanto Maruto yajanti |* “Let me invoke you for help, o Indra and Agni, with well-spoken words, such as are acceptable to the gods ; for sages skilled in sacrifice, when performing sacred rites, quick as the Maruts [?], worship with hymns.”

R. V. vi. 38, 3.—*Tañ ro dhiyā paramayā purōjām ajaram Indram abhi anāshi arkaiḥ ityādi |* “I adore thee, the ancient, imperishable Indra with an excellent hymn and with praises.”

R. V. vii. 67, 5.—*Prāchīm ū devā Aśvinā dhiyam me amri-dhrām sātaye kṛitañ vasūyum |* “O divine Aśvins, make my early and unwearied prayer which supplicates wealth, to be productive of blessings.”

R. V. vii. 85, 1.—*Punishe vām araxasam maniṣhām somam Indrāya Varuṇāya juhvat | g̥hrita-pratīkām Ushasam na devim ityādi |* “Offering soma to Indra and Varuna, I purify for you twain the sincere hymn, like the goddess Ushas, with glittering face.”

R. V. viii. 5, 18.—*Asmākam adya vām ayañ stomo vāhishto antamah | yurābhyam bhātu Aśvinā |* “May this hymn of ours approach near to you, to-day, o Aśvins, and be effectual in bearing you hither.”

R. V. viii. 8, 8.—*Kim anye paryāsate asmat stomebhir Aśvinā | putrah Kanvasya vām ?ishir gūrbhir Vatso avīvridhat |* “Aśvins, do others than we [?] sit round you with songs? Vatsa, the son of Kanya, has magnified you by his hymns.”

R. V. viii. 27, 11.—*Idā hi ra upastutim idā vāmasya bhak-taye upa vo viścavedaso namasyur āśrīxi |* “For now, possessors of all riches, now, in order to obtain wealth, have I, full of devotion, sent forth to you a hymn.”

R. V. x. 42. 1.—*Astā iru suprataram lāyam asyan bhūshann iva prabhara stomam asmai | rāchā vīprās tarata vācham aryo niramaya jaritah some. Inlram |* “Like an archer discharging his far-shooting arrow, or as it were making decorations, present the hymn to Indra. Sages, by your song, overcome the song of the enemy; worshipper, arrest Indra at the soma.”

R. V. x. 63, 17.—*Eva Platch sūnur avīvridhad ro viśve Ādityā Adite manīshī | iśānāso naro amartyena astāri jano divyo Gayena |* “Thus, all ye Adityas, Aditi, and ye ruling powers, has the wise son of Plati magnified you. The celestial race has been lauded by the immortal Gaya.” (I am unable to say in what sense the rishi here speaks of himself as *immortal*.)

R. V. x. 111, 1.—*Manīshīnah prabharadvam manīshām yathā yathā matayah santi nrīnam | Indrañ satyair ā ḫrayāma krite-bhīḥ sa hi vīro girvānasur vidānah |* “Sages, present the prayer, according as are the thoughts of men. Let us by our sincere rites stimulate [?] Indra, for he is a hero, he is wise, and loves our songs.”

In the following verse, from a hymn in praise of liberality, it is said, though no doubt only figuratively, that the *true rishi* is the prince who is bountiful to the priesthood.

R. V. x. 107, 6.—*Tam eva ḫishīm tam u brahmāñam āhur yajñanyām sāmagam ukthaśasam | sa śukrasya tanvo veda tisro yah prathamo daxinayā rarādha |* “He it is whom they call a rishi, a priest, a pious sacrificer, a chaunter of prayers, a singer of hymns; he it is who knows the three bodies of brilliant (Agni),—the man who is most prominent in bestowing gifts.”

SECT. IV.—*Passages of the Rig-veda in which a supernatural character is ascribed to the rishis or the hymns.*

In the present section I propose to collect the most distinct indications which I have noticed in the vedic hymns of any supernatural attributes attaching, in the opinion of the authors, either to the rishis themselves, or to their compositions. We shall see in the course of this enquiry (I.), that a certain superhuman character was ascribed by the later rishis, who composed the hymns, to some of their predecessors ; (II.) that expressions are occasionally employed by the rishis which appear to ascribe their compositions to a divine influence *generally*; while there is a still more numerous set of texts in which the hymns are attributed in various forms of phraseology to the agency of one or more *particular* and specified deities; and (III.) that there is a considerable number of passages in which a mysterious or magical power is ascribed to the hymns or metres.

I proceed to furnish specimens of these several classes of quotations.

I.—I adduce some passages which ascribe a superhuman character or supernatural faculties to the earlier rishis. These are the following :—

R. V. i. 179, 2.—*Ye chid hi pūrve ritasāpah āsan sākam̄ devebhir avadann ritāni | te chid avāsur ityādi |* “The pious sages who lived of old, and who conversed about sacred truths with the gods, led a conjugal life,” etc.

The sixty-second hymn of the tenth Mandala contains the following passage regarding the Angirases (see above, p. 120) :—

1. *The Angirases.*—R. V. x. 62, 1, 3.—*Ye yajñena daxinayā samaktāḥ Indrasya sakhyam amritatvam ānaśa | tebhyo bhadram Angiraso vah astu prati gribhnīta mānavām sumedhasah | 3. Ye ritena sūryam arohayan diri aprathayan pṛithivīm mātaram vi ityādi |* “Blessings be on the Angirases who, sanctified by sacrifice and liberality, attained the friendship of Indra and immortality. Do ye, o sage Angirases, graciously receive the

race of Manu. 3. They who by sacrifice caused the sun to ascend the sky ; and spread out our mother earth," etc. (My copy of the R. V. reads in the first line *ānaśa*. Perhaps it should be *ānasuh*, as in R. V. i. 164, 23.)

This is succeeded by the following verses :—

R. V. x. 62, 4, 5.—*Ayañ nābhā raduti ralguvo grihe deṇa-*
putrāḥ ṛishayas tat śrinotana . . . | cirūpāsaḥ id ṛishayas te id
gambhīra-repasah | Aṅgirasaḥ sūnaras te Agneḥ parijajñire |
 “This sage addresses you, brilliant beings, within [?] the house. Hear this, ye rishis, sons of the gods. The rishis are various in character, profound in emotion ; they are the sons of Angiras ; they have been born from Agni.”

(The last verse is quoted in the Nirukta, xi. 17. See Roth's illustrations of the passage.)

2. *Vasishtha*.—A supernatural character is attributed to Vasishtha also in the following passage (portions of which have been already quoted and illustrated in Part First, pp: 75 ff. and 122.)

R. V. vii. 33, 7 ff.—*Trayah kṛinranti bhurānasya retas tisrah*
projāḥ āryāḥ jyotiṣ-agrāḥ | trayo gharmāsaḥ ushasām sachante
sarrān it tān anuvidur Vasishṭhāḥ | 8. Sūryasyeva vaxatho
jyotiṣ eshām samudrasyera mahimā gabhīraḥ | vātasyeva prajavo
na anyena stomo Vasishṭhā anu etare val | 9. Te id nīnyam
hṛidayasya praketaḥ sahasra-valśam abhi sañcharanti | yamena
tatam paridhīm rayantah apsarasaḥ upa sedur Vasishṭhāḥ | 10.
Vidyuto jyotiḥ parisañjhānam Mitrā-Varunā yad apaśyatām
tvā | tat te janma uta ekaṁ Vasishṭha Agastyo yat trā visah
ājabhāra | 11. Utāsi Maitrāvaruno Vasishṭha Urvaśyāḥ brahman
manaso 'dhi jātah | drapsām skannam brahmaṇā daivyena viśve
devāḥ pushkare tvā adadanta | 12. Saḥ praketaḥ ubhayasya
pravidvān sahaśra-dānah uta vā sadānah | yamena tatam pari-
dhiṁ vayishyan apsarasaḥ parijajñe Vasishṭhāḥ | 13. Satre ha
jātāv ishitā namobhiḥ kumbhe retaḥ sisichituh samānam | tato ha
Mānah udīyāya madhyāt tato jātam ṛishim āhur Vasishṭham |
14. Uktā-bhṛitaṁ sāma-bhṛitam bibhartti grāvānam bibhrad

*pra radāti agre | upa enam ādhram̄ sumanasyamānāḥ ā ro
gachhāti pratrido Vasishthah |* “Three [gods] create the fecundating principle of the world ; [there exist] three excellent productions of which light is the first : three fires attend upon the dawn : all these the Vasishthas know. The splendour of these [sages] is like the glory of the sun ; their grandeur is profound as that of the ocean ; their impetuosity is like that of the wind ; your hymns, o Vasishthas, cannot be rivalled by any other bard. Through the longings of their hearts they seek after the mysterious [tree ?] with a thousand branches ; weaving the veil extended by Yama [Agni? see R. V. i. 66, 4.] the Vasishthas sat near the Apsaras. When Mitra and Varuna saw thee embracing the glean of the lightning, that was thy birth, Vasishtha, and [thou hadst] one [other], when Agastya brought thee from the house. And, Vasishtha, thou art the son of Mitra and Varuna, born, o priest, from the mind of Urvāśī ; all the gods received thee—the drop fallen through divine energy,—in the vessel. He the wise, knowing both [worlds ?], lavishing a thousand gifts or all gifts, Vasishtha, seeking to weave the veil extended by Yama, was produced from the Apsaras. Born at the sacrifice, and impelled by adorations, they [Mitra and Varuna] let the same procreative energy fall into the jar ; from the midst of this Māna (Agastya) issued forth ; from this men say the rishi Vasishtha was produced. He directs [?] the singer of the *uktha* and the chaunter of the *sāman* ; handling the soma stones, he leads the hymn ; wait on him with reverence and good-will ; Vasishtha comes to you.”

(Two of these verses are quoted in the Nirukta, verse 8, in xi. 20, and verse 11, in v. 13, 14. See also Prof. Roth's illustrations, p. 64, where he states his opinion that the foregoing verses which describe the miraculous birth of Vasishtha in the style of the epic mythology, are a later addition to an older hymn. I am unable to state the meaning of the word *pratridah.*)

The two following passages also have reference to knowledge

supernaturally communicated, or favours divinely conferred on Vasishtha. See Part First, p. 77.

R. V. vii. 87, 4.—*Uvācha me Varuno medhirāya trih sapta nāma aghnyā bibhartii | vidrān padasya guhyā na vochad yugāya ripraḥ uparāya śīraṇ |* “Varuna said to me, the sage, ‘the cow has thrice seven names.’ The wise and intelligent [god] instructing us, has declared the secrets of the celestial region [?] to this later generation.”

R. V. vii. 88, 4.—*Vasishṭhaṁ lu Varuno nāri ādhād ṛshim chakāra svapā mahobhiḥ | stotāram ripraḥ sudinatre ahnām yād nu dyāras tatanan yād ushasaḥ |* “Varuna has placed Vasishtha in the ship ; the beneficent [deity] has, by his mighty deeds, made him a rishi, [and caused] his worshipper to enjoy a fortunate existence, so that his days and dawns have been prolonged.” (See Part First, p. 77, note 32 ; and R. V. x. 101, 2, and x. 116, 9, in pp. 130 and 137, above.)

3. *Viśvamitra*.—In one or more of the texts which I shall next produce, a superhuman character is ascribed to Viśvamitra and the Kuśikas.

R. V. iii. 29, 15.—*Amitrāyudho marutām ira prayāḥ pratha-majāḥ brahmaṇo cīram id riduḥ | dyummurad brahma Kuśikāsa erire ekah eko dame Agniṁ samīdhire |* “Combating their foes, like hosts of Maruts, the first-born of Brahma [or prayer ?] are masters of all knowledge ; the Kuśikas have uttered a prayer accompanied with oblations ; every one of them has kindled Agni in his house.” (See Part First, p. 125, note.)

R. V. iii. 43, 5.—*Kurid mā gopām karuse janasya kurid rājā-nam Maghavann rītišan | kurid mā ṛshim papivāṁsaṁ sutasya kurid me vasvah amṛtasya śīraḥ |* “Thou assuredly makest me a shepherd of men ; thou assuredly makest me a king, o impetuous Maghavan ; thou assuredly makest me a rishi, a drinker of the soma ; thou wilt assuredly bestow upon me imperishable wealth.” (See First Part, p. 85.)

R. V. iii. 53, 9.—*Māhan ṛshir derajāḥ derajūtaḥ astabhnāt sindhum arṇavaṁ nrīchaxāḥ | Viśvāmitro yad avahat Sudāsam*

apriyāyata Kuśikebhīr Indrah | “The great rishi (Visvāmitra), director of men, sprung from the gods, and god-impelled, stemmed the watery current. When Visvāmitra guided Sudās, Indra was propitiated through the Kuśikas.” (See Part First, pp. 124, 125. Indra himself is called a Kausika in R. V. i. 10, 11. See Part First, p. 82.)

According to R. V. ix. 87, 3, certain mysterious knowledge is said to have been possessed by Uśanas: *Rishir riprah pura-etā janānām ribhur dhīra Uśanā kāryena* | *sa chid viveda nāhitām yad āsām apīchyām guhyaām nāma gonām* | “A wise rishi, a leader of men, skilful, and prudent, is Uśanas, through his insight as a seer; he has known the hidden mysterious name applied to these cows.”

In some hymns of the tenth Mandala, the rishis are spoken of as “seeing” different objects of contemplation; thus in R. V. x. 72, 1, 2, it is said: *Derānām u rayaām jānā prarochāma ripanyayā* | *ukthesu śasyumāneshu yaḥ paśyād uttare yuge* | *Brahmanaspatir etā saṁ karmāra ira adhamat derānām pūrrye yuge asataḥ sad ajāyata* | “Let us, from the love of praise, celebrate in chaunted songs the births of the gods—any of us who in this later generation may behold them. Brahmanaspati has kindled these births, as a blacksmith [blows a flame]: in the earliest age of the gods, the existent sprung from the non-existent.”

(The first of these verses is translated by Prof. Benfey in his Glossary to the Sāma-veda, p. 154.)

And in R. V. x. 79, 1, the rishi says: *Apāśyam asya mahato mahitvam amartyasya martyāsu vixu* | “I beheld the greatness of this great immortal among the race of mortals.” (Here, however, as Agni is the subject, the poet might easily enough see him, while his imagination would supply the figurative attributes which he goes on to describe.)

A still more decided instance, however, of this use of the verb *to see*, in the sense of supernatural insight, may be found in the verse of the Vālakhilya already quoted in Part Second, pp. 220, which will be repeated below.

The next two passages speak of the *radiance* of the rishis.

R. V. viii. 3, 3 (= S. V. i. 250 and Vāj. S. 33, 81).—*Imā u tvā purūvāso giro vārdhantu yā mama | pāvaka-varṇāḥ śuchayo vipaśchitāḥ abhi stomaīr anūshata |* “Lord of abundant wealth, may these prayers of mine magnify thee! Pure sages of fiery radiance have celebrated thee with hymns.”

R. V. viii. 6, 10.—*Aham id hi pituḥ pari medhām ṛitasya jagrabha | aham sūrya ira ajani |* “I have acquired the wisdom of [my] righteous father; I have become like the sun.”

The following texts, which occur in the last book of the Rig-veda, speak of *tapas* (“devotion” or “austerity”) being practised by the rishis much in the same way as the later epic literature does. This use of the word is not known in the earlier books of the R. V. (See Boehtlingk and Roth’s Lexicon, under the word *tapas*.)

R. V. x. 109, 4.—*Derā etasyām avadanta pūrve sapta ṛshayā tapase ye nisheduḥ |* “The ancient gods spoke of her, the seven rishis who sat down for devotion.”

R. V. x. 154, 2.—*Tapasā ye anādhṛisyās tapasā ye srar yayuḥ | tapo ye chakṣire mahas tāṁs chid eva api gachhatāt |* 5. *Sahasra-nīthāḥ kavayo ye gopāyanti sūryam ṛshīnāḥ tapas-rato Yama tapojān api gachhatāt |* “Come to those who through devotion are invincible, who by devotion have gone to heaven, who have performed great austerity. 5. Come, Yama, to the sages of a thousand songs who guard the sun (see Wilson, Vish. Pur. pp. 234, 235), to the devout rishis, whose nature is devotion.”

R. V. x. 190, 1.—*Ritañcha satyañcha abhiddhāt tapaso adhyajāyata | tato rātrī ajāyata tataḥ samudrah aruṇavah |* “Right and truth sprang from kindled devotion; thence sprang night, thence the watery ocean.”

In R. V. x. 167, 1, it is even said that Indra attained heaven by austerity: *Tvaṁ tapah paritapya ajayah svah |* “By performing austerity thou didst conquer heaven.”

In some places the gods are said to possess in the most emi-

nent degree the qualities of *rishis*, or *kavis*. This may imply, *e converso*, that the rishis were conscious of a certain affinity with the divine nature, and conceived themselves to participate in some degree in the superior wisdom and knowledge of the deities.

R. V. i. 31, 1.—*Tram Agne prathamo Angirā rishir devo derānām abharuk śivah sakha ityādi* | 2. *Tram Agne prathamo Angirastamah kavir devānām paribhūshasi vrataṁ* | “Thou, Agni, the earliest *rishi* Angiras, a god, wast the auspicious friend of the gods. . . . Thou, Agni, the earliest and most Angiras-like sage, decoratest the ceremonial of the gods.”

R. V. i. 66, 2.—. . . *Rishir na stubheā vixu prasastah ityādi* | “Like a *rishi*, who praises [the gods], he (Agni) is famous among the people,” etc.

R. V. iii. 21, 3.—. . . *Rishih śreshthah samidhyase yajñasya pra aritā bhara* | “Thou, Agni, the most eminent *rishi*, art kindled; be the protector of the sacrifice.”

R. V. v. 29, 1.—. . . *Archanti tā marutah pūta-daxās tram eśham rishir Indra asi dhīrah* | “The Maruts, endowed with pure force, worship thee; thou, Indra, art their *rishi*.” (Sāyana, however, here renders *rishi* by *drashṭā*, “ beholder.”)

R. V. vi. 14, 2.—*Agnir id hi prachetah Agnir vedhastamah rishih* | “Agni is wise; Agni is a most sage *rishi*.”

R. V. viii. 6, 41.—*Rishir hi pārcajā asi ekah īśanah ojasā Indra choshkūyase rasu* | “Thou art an anciently-born *rishi*, who alone rulest by thy might; Indra, thou lavishest riches.”

R. V. viii. 16, 7.—*Indro brahmā Indrah rishir Indrah purū-puru-hūtah mahān mahibhīh śachibhīh* | “Indra is a priest, Indra is a *rishi*, Indra is much invoked; he is great through his great exploits.”

R. V. ix. 96, 18 (= S. V. ii. 526).—*Rishimanā yaḥ rishikrit svarshāḥ sahasranīthah padavīḥ karinām* | “Soma, *rishi-minded*, *rishi-maker*, bestower of good, lord of a thousand songs, the path [leader?] of sagés,” etc.

R. V. ix. 107, 7.—. . . *Rishir ripro vicharayus trañ kavir*

abhavo devavītamah ityādi | “A *rishi*, a sage, intelligent, thou (Soma) wast a poet, most devoted to the gods,” etc.

R. V. x. 27, 22.—. . . *Indrāya sunvad rishaye cha śixat* | “. . . Let [men] present libations to Indra, and offerings to the *rishi*.”

R. V. x. 112, 9.—*Ni shu sīda ganapate ganesu tvām āhur vīpratamañ karīnām* | *na rīte trat kriyate kiñchana āre mahām arkam Maghavānś chitram archa* | “Sit, lord of multitudes, among our multitudes; they call thee the greatest of sages [or poets]; nothing is done without, or apart from, thee; receive, Maghavan, our great and beautiful hymn.”

R. V. x. 115, 5.—*Agnih kanvatamah kanva-sakhā ityādi* | “Agni is the greatest of the Kanvas, the friend of Kanva,” etc.

II.—The Vedic rishis, as we have seen, expected to receive from their gods every variety of temporal blessings, strength, long life, offspring, riches, cattle, rain, food, and victory, and they also looked for forgiveness of their offences, and exaltation to paradise, to the same benefactors. Hence it would be nothing more than we might have anticipated, if we should further find them asking their different deities to enlighten their minds, to direct their ceremonies, to stimulate their devotion, to augment their powers of poetical expression, and to inspire them with religious fervour for the composition of their hymns. I think the following passages will justify this expectation by showing that the rishis (though, as we have seen, they frequently speak of the hymns as their own work) did also sometimes entertain the idea that their prayers, praises, and ceremonies generally, were supernaturally suggested and directed. One of the modes (if not the principal one) in which this idea is expressed is, as we shall discover, the personification of speech under different appellations. The following are the passages to which I refer: they are—

First, such as refer to the gods generally:

R. V. i. 37, 4.—*Pra vah śardhāya ghrishvaye tvesha-dyumnāya śushmine* | *brahma devattam gāyata* | “To [that which is] your strength, the vigorous, overpowering, energetic, [host of

Maruts] sing the *god-given* prayer." (See, however, Part Second, p. 219, note 174.)

S. V. i. 299.—*Tvashṭā no daivyaṁ vachah Parjanyo Brahmanaspatih | putrair bhrātṛibhir Aditir nu pātu no dushtaram trāmanāṁ vachah |* "May Tvastri, Parjanya, and Brahmanaspati [prosper] our *divine* utterance: may Aditi with her [?] sons and brothers prosper our invincible and protective utterance."

In the next passage, the hymn or prayer is spoken of as *inconceivable*.

R. V. i. 152, 5.—*Achittam brahma jujuśur yuvānah pra Mitre dhāma Varune grīṇantah |* "The youths received with joy the incomprehensible prayer, celebrating the glorious abode in Mitra and Varuna [?]."

(Though Sāyana, in his comment on this passage, does not give to the word *yuvānah* the sense of youths, he interprets it so, and explains it of the Maruts, in his note on R. V. i. 165, 2.)

In R. V. x. 20, 10, Vimada, a rishi, is connected with the immortals:—*Agne Vimado manīshām ūrjonapād amṛitebhīḥ sajoshā girah ācārat sumatīr iyānah ityādi |* "O Agni, son of strength, Vimada, united with the immortals, hastening, has brought to thee a product of thought, and beautiful hymns."

In the two following texts the gods are said to have *generated* the hymn or prayer:

R. V. viii. 88, 4.—*Sūkta-vākam prathamum ād id Agnim ād id havir ajanayanta derāḥ | sa eshām yañno abharat tanūpāḥ |* "The gods first *generated* the hymn, then Agni, then the oblation. This sacrifice was the protector of their life."

R. V. x. 61, 7.—. . . *Svādhyo ajanayan brahma devā Vāstoshpatiñ vratapām nirataxan |* "The thoughtful gods have *generated* prayer: they have fashioned Vastoshpati the protector of sacred rites."

(Who, however, are the "gods" here intended? The word *deva* is sometimes understood by Sāyana to denote the worshippers; and it may mean no more in these two passages. See Sāyana on R. V. iii. 34, 7, where he makes *derebhyaḥ*-*derana*-*ślebhyaḥ* *stotribhyaḥ*.)

In the latter of the two following verses, Vāch (speech) is said to be divine, and to have been *generated* by the gods. Though Speech is here spoken of generally, and nothing is said of the hymns, still these seem to have come to be connected with her in the minds of the Vedic bards, and to be regarded as her most solemn and important expression.

R. V. viii. 89, 10.—*Vad rāg vadanti arichetanāni rāshṭri devānām nishasāda mandrā | chatasra ūrjaṁ duduhe payāmī keva srid asyāḥ paramēm jagāma | 11. Devīm vācham ajanyaanta derās tām risvarūpāḥ paśuro radanti | sā no mandrā isham ūrjaṁ duhānā dhenuṁ rāg asmān upa sushtutā ā etu |* “When Vāch, speaking unintelligible things, queen of the gods, sat down, conferring delight, the four regions milked forth sustenance and waters: whither has her highest station departed? The gods *generated* the divine Vāch; animals of all kinds utter her: may this cow Vāch which brings us joy, and yields us nourishment and sustenance,—approach us, when we celebrate her praises.”

The last verse (as well as R. V. viii. 90, 16, which will be quoted below), derives some illustration from the following passage of the Brīhad Āranyaka Upanishad, p. 982 (p. 251 English trans.), in which also Vāch is designated as a cow:—*Vāchām dhenum upāsita | tasyāś chatrārah stanāḥ srāhā-kāro rashat-kāro hanta-kārah sradhā-kārah | tasyā drau stanau derā upajīcanti srāhā-kārañcha rashat-kārañcha hanta-kāram manushyāḥ svadhā-kāram pitrah | tasyāḥ prāṇa rishabho mano ratsah |* “Let a man worship the cow Vāch. She has four udders, the formulæ *srāhā*, *rashat*, *hanta*, and *sradhā*. The gods live upon her two udders, *srāhā* and *rashat*; men upon *hanta*; and the patriarchs upon *svadhā*. Breath is her bull; the mind, her calf.”

(The two verses, R. V. viii. 89, 10 and 11, occur in the Nirukta, xi. 28, 29. Roth (in his Illustrations), p. 152, says the unintelligible utterance of Vāch in verse 10, means thunder. Though this be the case, the word appears to have a more

general signification in the next verse, and to refer to speech in general, personified as a divine being. The speech which all the animals utter cannot of course be thunder.

In some of the preceding verses of this hymn there is a curious reference made to some sceptical doubts regarding the existence of Indra; which I quote here, though unconnected with the present subject. R. V. viii. 89, 3, 4.—*Pra su stomam bharata vājayantam Indrāya satyām yaśi satyam asti | na Indro asti iti nema u tra āha ka īm dadarśa kam abhi starāma | Ayam asmi jarituk paśya mā iha visrā jātāni abhi asmi mahnā | ritasya mā pradiso rāddhayanti ādardiro bhurāna dardarīni |* “Present to Indra a hymn soliciting food, a true [hymn] if he truly exists. ‘Indra does not exist,’ says some one : ‘who has seen him? whom shall we praise?’ ‘I am here, worshipper’ [answers Indra]; ‘behold me, I surpass all creatures in greatness; the different points of the sacrifice augment me; crushing, I destroy the worlds.’”)

Second: the next set of passages which I shall bring forward either refer to Sarasvatī, Vach, Dhishanā, etc. (various names of the goddess of speech, or different personifications of speech, or of prayer), or at least speak of prayer as *divine*.

R. V. i. 3, 11, 12.—*Chodayitrī sūnritānām chetantī sumatīnām | yajñānām dadhe Sarasvatī | . . . dhiyo viścā virājati |* “Sarasvatī, who furthers the truthful [or our hymns], and who stimulates the wise [or our prayers], has sustained our sacrifice. . . She enlightens all intellects.”

R. V. i. 22, 10.—*Ā gnāḥ Agne iha avase Hotrān yarishṭha Bhāratīm | Varūtrīm Dhishanān raha |* “Bring here, youthful Agni, to our help, the wives [of the gods], Hotrā, Bhārtū, Varūtri, and Dhishanā.”

(*Varūtri*, “the eligible,” may be merely an epithet of Dhishana which, according to Sāyana = *vāg-devī*, “the goddess of speech.”)

R. V. i. 31, 11.—*Ilām akriyācan manusasya śāsanām ityādi |* “The gods made Ilā to be the instructress of men.” (See Pro-

fessor Wilson's note on this passage, p. 82 of his translation of the R. V. vol i.)

R. V. i. 109, 1.— . . . *Na anyā yuval prumatir asti mahyām
sa vām dhiyām rājayantim ataxum* | 2. . . . *Athā somasya pra-
yatī yurabhyām Indrāgnī stomām janayāmī navyam* | 4. *Ku-
rābhyaṁ devī dhishanā madāya Indrāgnī somam uśatī sunoti* |
1. “I have no other wisdom than [that which proceeds] from you (Indra and Agni), I who have *fabricated* for you a hymn supplicating food. 2. . . . I then, together with a libation of soma, *generate* for you, Indra and Agni, a new hymn. 4. The *divine hymn* [or *rite*], longing, pours forth the soma for your exhilaration.”

(The wisdom to which the rishi refers at the beginning of this passage does not, however, necessarily, mean the power of composing hymns. In other clauses, this text contains the same words expressive of the *fabrication* and *generation* of the hymns by the rishi, which we have already met with in section 3, pp. 130-136).

R. V. ii. 3, 8.—*Sarasratī sādhayantī dhiyām nah Ilā devī Bhāratī visratūrtih* | *Tisro devīḥ sādhayā barhīr edam achhidram pāntā śaranyaṁ nishadya* | “May Sarasvatī, perfecting our hymn [or rite], may the divine Ilā, and the all-pervading Bhāratī; may these three goddesses, seated on the place of sacrifice, prosper this faultless sacrifice with the oblation.”

R. V. iii. 18, 3.— . . . *Yārad iśe brahmaṇā vandamānah imām dhiyām sāta-seyāya devīm* | “Worshipping thee with a prayer according to the best of my power, [I offer?] this *divine* prayer to obtain unbounded wealth.”

R. V. iii. 32, 14.—*Vivasha yad mā dhishanā jajāna ityādi* | “When the thought [or voice] entered into me, I gave it birth,” etc. (If *dhishanā* here mean “thought,” it need not refer to anything supernatural.)

R. V. iv. 34, 1.—*Idā hi vo dhishanā devī ahnām adhāt pītim ityādi* | “For on these days the *divine* voice has ordained that you should drink soma,” etc.

R. V. iv. 43, 1, 2.—*Ka u śravat katamo yajñiyānāṁ vandāru devaḥ katamo jushāte | kasya imāṁ devīm amṛiteshu preshṭhāṁ hr̥idi śreshyāma sushṭutīm suharyām |* “Who will hear us? which of all the objects of adoration? which of all the gods will receive our praises? In the heart of whom among the immortals can we infix this our *divine* and dearest hymn, accompanied by excellent oblations?”

R. V. vii. 34, 1.—*Pra śukrā etu devī manīshā asmat sutashṭo ratho na rājī |* “May prayer, brilliant and *divine*, proceed from us, like a well-fabricated chariot drawn by steeds.”

R. V. vii. 34, 9.—*Abhi ro devīm dhiyām dadidhram pra ro decatrā rāchaṁ kriṇudhram |* “Receive towards you the *divine* hymn; proclaim the song for yourselves among the gods.”

R. V. vii. 90, 3.—. . . *Rāye devī dhishanā dhāti devam |* “The *divine* voice disposes [?] the god to bestow [?] wealth.” (This verse is translated by Professor Benfey in his Glossary to the *Sāma-veda* under the root *rid*, p. 170.)

R. V. vii. 96, 3.—*Bhadram id bhadrā kriṇarat Sarasvatī akarāri chetati vājinīcati | gīṇānā Jamadagnivat sturānā cha Vasishthacat |* “May the gracious Sarasvati bless us. The generous [goddess] rich in oblations, stimulates us, when praised after the manner of Jamadagni or lauded after the fashion of Vasishtha.”

R. V. viii. 90, 16.—*Vachocidamūrācham udīrayantīm viśvā- bhir dhībhir upatishthamānām | devīm decebhyah pari cyushūm gām ā mā arrikta martyo dabhrachetāḥ |* “Let not any mortal of little intelligence do violence to the cow, the *divine* Vāch, who is skilled in praise, who utters her voice aloud, who associates with all the gods, and arrives with all the hymns.”

R. V. ix. 33, 5.—*Abhi brahmīr anūshata yahvīr ṛtasya mātarō marmrijyante divāḥ śisūm |* “The great devotional [?] mothers of the sacrifice have uttered praise: they decorate the child of the sky.”

R. V. x. 35, 6.—. . . *Rāyo janitrīm dhishanām upa brure |* “I address myself to Dhishanā, the generatrix of wealth.”

R. V. x. 71, 1 ff.—*Bṛihaspate prathamāñ vācho agrāñ yat
prairata nāmadheyam dudhānāḥ | yad eṣhāñ śr̄es̄hāñ yad
aripram āśit preṇā tu d eṣhāñ nihiṭāñ guhā āvīḥ |* 2. *Saktum
iva titānā punanto yatra dhīrā manasā vācham akrata | atrā
sakhāyāḥ sakhyāni jānatā bhadrā eṣhāñ laxmīr nikātā adhī
vāchi |* 3. *Yajñena vāchāḥ padavīyam āyan tām anwavindann
r̄ishishu prarishṭām | tām ābhṛitya vyadadhūḥ purutrā tām
sapta rebhā abhi sannarunte |* 4. *Uta traḥ paśyan na dadarśa
vācham uta traḥ śr̄inevan na śr̄inoti enām | uto traśmai tanraśā
risasre jāyeva patye uśatī surāsāḥ |* 5. *Uta trañ sakhye sthira-
pitum āhur naināñ hinrānty api rājineshu | adhenvā charati
māyayā esha vāchāñ śus̄urāñ aphałām apushkpām |* 6. *Yas
tityāja sachividāñ sakhyāyāñ na tasya vāchi api bhāgo asti | yad
iñ śr̄inoti alakāñ śr̄inoti na hi praveda sukṛitasya panthām |*

1. “O Brihaspati, that first and principal name of speech (Vāch), that which possessing, they uttered aloud [?], that which was to them the most excellent and spotless, that which they had kept secret has, through love, [been made] manifest. 2. Wherever the wise,—cleansing, as it were, meal with a sieve,—have uttered speech with intelligence, their friends recognize [their] friendliness; an auspicious fortune [or sign] is impressed upon their speech. 3. Through sacrifice they followed the track of Vāch, *and found her entered into the rishis*: bearing her, they divided her into many portions: her the seven poets celebrate. 4. One man, seeing, sees not Vāch; hearing, he hears her not; to another she reveals her form, as an elegantly attired and loving wife displays her person to her husband. 5. They say that one man has a sure defence in [her] friendship; men cannot injure him even in battle; but that man consorts with an unprofitable delusion who has [only] heard speech [Vāch] which is [to him] without fruit or flower. 6. He who has abandoned his discerning friend, has no portion in Vāch; whatever he hears he hears in vain; he knows not the path of virtue.”

(The second, fourth, and fifth verses of this obscure hymn are quoted in the Nirukta, iv. 10; i. 19, and 20; and are explained

in Professor Roth's Illustrations. Verses 2 and 4 are also quoted and interpreted in the Mahābhāshya; see pp. 30 and 31 of Dr. Ballantyne's edition. The verse which is of most importance for my present purpose, is, however, the third, which speaks of Vāch having *entered into the rishis*. The idea of Vāch being divided into many portions will be found again below in R. V. x. 125, 3.)

R. V. x. 96, 10.— . . . *Mahī chid hi dhishunā aharyud ityādi* | “The great voice [or hymn] has desired thee.”

R. V. x. 110, 8 (= Vāj. S. 29, 33).—*Ā no yajñam Bhāratī tūyam etu Ilā manushrad iha chetayanti | tisro devir barkir ā idam syonam Sarasvatī sapasuh sadantu* | “Let Bhāratī come quickly here to our sacrifice, with Ilā, who instructs us like Manu [or like a man], and with Sarasvatī: let these three goddesses, skilful in rites, sit down upon this beautiful sacrificial grass.”

R. V. x. 125, 3.—*Aham rāshṭri sangamanī vasūnām chikitushū prathamā yajñiyānām | tām mā derā ryadadhuḥ purutrā bhāristhātrām bhāri āveśayantīm | 4. Mayā so annam atti yo vipasyati yaḥ prāṇīti ya iṁ śrīnoti uktam | amantaś mām te upaxiyanti śrudhi śruta śraddhicām te vadāmi | 5. Aham eva svayam idām vadāmi jushṭām devebhir uta mānushebhīḥ | yañ kāmaye tañ tam ugrañ kṛīnomi tam brahmānañ tam ṛishiñ tañ sumedhām | 3. “I am the queen, the centre of riches, intelligent, the first of the objects of adoration: the gods have separated me into many portions, have assigned me many abodes, and made me widely pervading. 4. He who has insight, who lives, who hears [my] sayings, eats through me [the sacred] food. Those men who are foolish destroy me, [or, those who disregard me, perish]. Listen, thou who art learned, I declare to thee what is worthy of belief. 5. I myself make known this which is agreeable both to gods and men. Him whom I love I make terrible, [I make] him a priest, [I make] him a rishi, [I make] him intelligent.”* (This passage occurs also in the Atharva-veda, iv. 30, 2 ff., but with some

various readings, as *ārēśayantah* for *ārēśayantīm*, and *śraddheyam* for *śraddhivam*, etc. The hymn is translated by Mr. Colebrooke, Ess. i. 32, or p. 16 of W. and N.'s ed.)

R. V. x. 176, 2.—*Pra decaṁ deryā dhīyā bharata Jātavedasam haryā no raxad ānushak* | “By divine prayer produce Jātavedas: may he present our oblations in order.”

R. V. x. 177, 1.—*Patañgam aktam asurasya māyayā hrīdā paśyanti manasā vipaśchitah* | *sumudre antuh karayo richaxate marīchīnām padum ichhanti vedhasah* | 2. *Patañgo rācham manasā bibhartti tām Gandharvo arādad garbhe antah* | *tām dyotamānām svaryam manīshām ritasya pade karayo nīpānti* | “Sages behold with the heart and mind the Bird enveloped by the wisdom of the Asura: the wise perceive him in the sky: the prudent seek after the abode of his rays. 2. The Bird cherishes speech with his mind: the Gandharva hath uttered her in the womb: the bards preserve in the place of sacred rites this shining and celestial intellect.” (See also R. V. x. 189, 3, *vāk patangāya dhīyate*.)

Third: I shall now adduce the passages in which other Vedic deities, whether singly or in concert, are spoken of as concerned in the production of the hymns.

Aditi.—In R. V. viii. 12, 14, Aditi is mentioned as fulfilling this function: *Yad uta srarāje Aditih stomam Indrāya jījanat puru-prāśastam ūtaye ityādi* | “When Aditi generated for the self-resplendent Indra a hymn abounding in praises, to supplicate succour,” etc.

Agni.—R. V. i. 18, 6, 7.—*Sadasaspatim abhutam priyam Indrasya kāmyam* | *sanim medhām ayāsisham* | *yasmād rite na siddhyati yajño vipaśchitāś chana* | *sa dhīnām yogam invati* | 6. “I have resorted, for wisdom, to Sadasaspati (Agni), the wonderful, the dear, the beloved of Indra, the beneficent; (7) without whom the sacrifice of the wise does not succeed: he promotes the course of our ceremonies.”

R. V. iv. 5, 3.—*Sāma dvibarhā mahi tigma-bhrishṭih sahasra-retā vrishabhas turishmān* | *padaṁ na gor apagūlham viridrān*

*Agnir mahyam̄ pra id u vochad manisham̄ | 6. Idam me Agne
kriyate pāvaka amīnate gurum bhāram̄ na manma | Vrīhad
dadhātha dhrishatā gabhrām̄ yahvam̄ pṛishṭham̄ prayasā sapta-
dhātu |* “Agni occupying two positions, the fierce-flaming, the
prolific, the showerer of benefits, the opulent, who knows the
sacred hymn, mysterious as the track of a [missing cow], has
declared to me the knowledge [of it]. 6. To me who am feeble,
though innoxious, thou, o Agni, purifier, hast given, as a heavy
load, this great, profound, and extensive hymn, of seven elements,
with efficacious oblations.” (I find a difficulty, even with the
help of Sāyana’s Commentary, in translating the remaining
word of this verse, *pṛishṭham̄*. See Part Second, p. 489.)

R. V. iv. 6, 1.—*Trañ hi viśram abhi asi manma pra vedhasaś
chit tirasi manisham̄ |* “Thou presidest over all thoughts [or
prayers]; thou promotest the praises of the sage.”

R. V. iv. 11, 3.—*Tread Agne kāryā tread manishās trad ukthā
jāyante rādhyāni |* “From thee, Agni, proceed poetic thoughts;
from thee the products of the mind; from thee effective hymns.”

R. V. x. 21, 5.—*Agnir jāto Atharvanā vidud viśrāni kāvyā |*
“Agni, generated by Atharvan, is acquainted with all wisdom.”

R. V. x. 91, 8.—. . . *Medhākārañ ridathasya prasādhanam
Agnim ityādi |* “Agni, the giver of understanding, the accom-
plisher of sacrifice.”

R. V. x. 4, 5.—*Yad ro vayam̄ pramināmo rratāni ridushām̄
devā aridustarāsaḥ | Agnis tad riścam̄ āpriṇāti vidēn yebhir
devān̄ ritubhiḥ kalpayāti | Yat pākatrā manasā dānadaxā na
yajñasya manrete martyāsaḥ | Agnis tad hotā kratuvid vijānan
yajishto devān̄ rituso yajāti |* “When, o [ye] gods, we, the most
unwise among the wise, undertake sacred rites in your honour, the
wise Agni completes them all, at the stated seasons which he
assigns to the gods. When men, devoted to sacrifice, do not,
from their ignorance, rightly comprehend the mode of worship,
Agni, the skilful sacrificer, and most eminent of priests, know-
ing the ceremonial, worships the gods at the proper seasons.”

(As rites and hymns were closely united in the practice of the

early Indians, and are often expressed by the same words; if Agni was supposed to be the director of the one, viz., the oblations, he might easily come to be also regarded as aiding in the production of the other—the hymns. Verse 4, occurs also in the A. V. xix. 59, 1, 2, where, however, *āprinātu* is read instead of *āprināti*, and in place of the words *yebhir devān*, etc., at the close of the verse, we have, *somaścha yo brāhmaṇān ā vireṣa* | “and Soma, who entered into the priests.”)

Brahmanaspati.—R. V. i. 40, 5, 6.—*Pra nūnam Brahmanaspatir mantrañ radati ukthyam | yasminn Indro Varuno Mitrah Aryamā derā okāṁsi chakrire | Tam id vochena vidu-theshu śambhuram mantrañ derā anehasam ityādi* | “Brahmanaspati (abiding in the worshipper’s mouth, according to the scholiast) utters the hymn accompanied with praise, in which the gods, Indra, Varuna, Mitra, and Aryaman, have made their abode. Let us utter, gods, at sacrifices, that spotless hymn, conferring felicity.” (Roth in his Lexicon considers *okas* to mean “good pleasure,” “satisfaction.” See also his Essay on Brahma and the Brāhmans, Jour. of the Germ. Or. Soc. i. 74.)

Bṛihaspati.—R. V. ii. 23, 2.—*Uṣrāḥ ira sūryo jyotiṣhā maho riśreshām ij janitā brahmaṇām asi* | “As the glorious sun by his lustre generates rays, so art thou (Bṛihaspati) the generator of all prayers.”

Gandharva.—According to Professor Roth (see under the word in his Lexicon), the Gandharva is represented in the Veda as a deity who knows and reveals the secrets of heaven, and divine truths in general; in proof of which he quotes the following texts:—

R. V. x. 139, 5.—*Visvāvasur abhi tad no grīnātu diryo Gandharvo rajaso vimānah | Yad rā ghā satyam uta yad na vidma dhiyo hinvāno dhiyah id naḥ aryāḥ* | “May the celestial Gandharva Visvāvasu, who is the measurer of the atmosphere, declare to us that which is true, or which we know not. May he receive and delight in our hymns, [or, stimulating our interests, may he prosper our hymns].”

A. V. ii. 1, 2.—*Pra tad roched amṛitasya ridrān Gandharro dhāma paramām guhā yat* | “May the Gandharva, who knows the world of the immortals, declare to us that supreme and mysterious abode.”

Indra.—R. V. iii. 54, 17.—*Mahat tad rāḥ kavayāś chāru nāma yad ha derā bhavatha riṣve Indrc | sakhā Ribhubhīḥ puru-hūta priyebhir imām dhiyaṁ sātaye taxata nāḥ* | “Great, o sage [Aśvins], is that cherished name of yours, through which [or, that] ye all become gods with (in) Indra. Do thou, much invoked (Indra), our friend, with the beloved Ribhus, fabricate (or dispose) this hymn for our welfare.” (This may merely mean that Indra was asked to give a favourable issue to the prayer of the worshipper, not to compose his hymn for him. See Roth’s Lexicon, under the word *tax*, 3.)

R. V. vi. 26, 3.—*Tvam̄ karīm̄ chodayah arkasātāv ityādi* | “Thou (Indra) didst stimulate the poet in the composition of his hymns,” etc. (Śāyana renders *arkasātāu*, “for the sake of finding food.”)

R. V. vi. 18, 15.—*Kṛishrā kṛitno akṛitaṁ yat te asti ukthaṁ nariyo janayasra yaññaiḥ* | “Energetic (Indra), do what thou hast never yet done; generate a new song with the sacrifices.”

R. V. vi. 34, 1.—*Sām̄ cha tre jagmūr giraḥ Indra pūrvvīr vi cha trad yanti ribhvo manīshāḥ* | “Many hymns are congregated in thee, o Indra, and numerous products of the mind issue from thee.” (This verse has been already quoted in p. 124.)

R. V. vi. 47, 10.—*Indra mṛīla mahyām jīrātum ichcha chodāya dhiyam ayaso na dhārām | Yat kiñcha ahaṁ trāyur idām vadāmī taj jushasva kṛidhi mā dcravantam* | “O Indra, gladden me, decree life for me, sharpen my intellect like the edge of an iron instrument. Whatever I, longing for thee, now utter, do thou accept; give me divine protection.” (Compare with the word *chodaya* the use of the word *prachodayāt* in the Gāyatri, R. V. iii. 62, 10, which will be given below.)

R. V. vii. 97. 3.—*Tam u namasā havirbhīḥ suśevam Brahmanaspatim grīñishe | Indram̄ śloko māhi daiwyah sishaktu yo*

brahmaṇo devakṛitusya rājā | 5. *Tam ā no arkam amṛitāya jushṭam ime dhāsur amṛitāsaḥ purājāḥ ityādi* | “3. I invoke with reverence and with offerings the beneficent Brahmanaspati. Let a great and divine song celebrate Indra, who is king of the prayer made by the devas. 5. May these ancient immortals make this our hymn acceptable to the immortal,” etc. (Are we to understand the word *deva* here of *gods* or *priests*?)

R. V. viii. 13, 7.—*Pratnaraj janaya girab̄ sriṇudhi jaritur havam* | “As of old, generate hymns; hear the invocation of thy worshipper.”

R. V. x. 112, 9.—*Ni shu sūla gaṇapate gaṇeshu tvām āhur vīpratamañ karīnām na ḷite trat kriyate kiñchana āre mahām arkam Magharan chitram archa* | “Lord of assemblies, sit amid our multitudes; they call thee the wisest of poets. *Nothing is done without, or apart from thee*; Maghavan, receive with favour our great and beautiful hymn.” (Already quoted in p. 148.)

Indra and Vishnu.—R. V. vi. 69, 2.—*Iā visrāsām janitārā matinām Indrā-Vishṇū kalaśā soma-dhānā Pra vām girab̄ śasyamānāḥ uacantu pra stomāso gīyamānāsaḥ arkaik* | “Indra and Vishnu, ye who are the generators of all hymns, who are the vessels into which soma is poured, may the praises which are now recited gratify you, and the songs which are chaunted with encomiums.”

Indra and Varuna.—The following passage is not, properly speaking, a portion of the Rig-veda, as it is part of one of the Vālakhilyas or apocryphal additions (described in Part Second, p. 210), which are found inserted between the 48th and 49th hymns of the 8th Mandala. From its style, however, it appears to be nearly as old as some parts of the R. V.

Indrāvarunā yad ḷishibhyo manīshām vācho matīm śrutam adattam agre yāni sthānāny asrījanta dhīrā yajñām tāvānās tapasā 'bhyapasyam | “Indra and Varuna, I have seen through devotion that which ye formerly gave to the rishis, wisdom, understanding of speech, sacred lore, and all the places which the sages created, when performing sacrifice.” (See Part Second, p. 220.)

Pūshan.—R. V. x. 26, 4.—*Mañsimahi tvā vayam asmākam
deva Pūshan matināñcha sādhanam viprāññāñcha ādharam |*
“We adore thee, divine Pushan, the accomplisher of our hymns,
and the stimulator of sages.”

Savitri.—R. V. iii. 62 (= S. V. ii. 812, and Vāj. S. iii. 35).—
*Tat Savitur varenyam bhargo devasya dhīmahi | dhiyo yo nah
prachodayāt |* “We meditate that excellent glory of the divine
Savitri; may he stimulate our understandings [or hymns, or
rites].”

(This is the celebrated Gāyatrī, the most sacred of all the texts in the Veda. See Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. pp. 29, 30, 127, and 175; or pp. 14, 15, 78, and 109 of W. and N.'s ed. Benfey (S. V. p. 277) translates the Gāyatrī thus: “May we receive the glorious brightness of this, the generator, of the god who shall prosper our works.”

The Linga Purana (Part II. sec. 48, 5 ff., Bombay lithographed ed.) gives the following “varieties” of the Gāyatrī, adapted to modern Śaiva worship: *Gāyatri-bhedāḥ || Tatpuru-
shāya vidmahe rāg-visuddhāya dhīmahi | Tan nah Śivah prach-
odayāt || Ganāmbikāyai vidmahe karmasiddhyai cha dhīmahi |*
*Tan no Gaurī prachodayāt || Tatpurushāya vidmahe Mahāde-
vāya dhīmahi | Tan no Rudrah prachodayāt || Tatpurushāya
vidmahe Vaktratundāya dhīmahi | Tan no Dantih prachodayāt ||*
*Mahāsenāya vidmahe rāgvīsuddhāya dhīmahi | Tan nah Skan-
dah prachodayāt || Tixnaśringāya vidmahe Vedapādāya dhī-
mahi | Tan no Vrishabha prachodayāt ityādi |* “(1) We contemplate That Purusha, we meditate him who is pure in word [or purified by the word]; may That Śiva stimulate us. (2) We contemplate Ganāmbikā, and we meditate Karmasiddhi (the accomplishment of works); may That Gaurī stimulate us. (3) We contemplate That Purusha, and we meditate Mahādeva; may That Rudra stimulate us. (4) We contemplate That Purusha, and we meditate Vaktratunda (Ganesā); may That Danti (the elephant) stimulate us. (5) We contemplate Mahāseṇa (Kārtikeya), and we meditate him who is pure in word; may That

Skanda stimulate us. (6) We contemplate Tixnasringa (the sharp-horned), and we meditate the Veda-footed ; may Vrisha (the bull) stimulate us.”

Soma.—R. V. vi. 47, 3.—*Ayam me pītah udīyartti rācham ayam manīshām uśatīm ajīgah* | “This [soma], when drunk, stimulates my speech [or hymn] ; this called forth the ardent thought.”

It may be said that this and the other following texts relating to *soma*, should not be quoted as proofs that any idea of divine inspiration was entertained by the ancient Indian bards, as they can mean nothing more than that the rishis were sensible of a stimulating effect on their thoughts and powers of expression, produced by the exhilarating draughts of the juice of that plant in which they indulged. But the rishis had come to regard *Soma* as a god, and apparently to be passionately devoted to his worship. See Part Second, pp. 470 ff., and especially pp. 474, 475.

A. V. viii. 48, 3.—*Apāma somam amṛitā abhūma aganma jyotir avidāma dcrān* | *kiñ nūnam asmān kṛīparad arātiḥ kim u dhūrttir amṛita martyasya* | “We have drunk the *soma*, we have become immortal, we have entered into light, we have known the gods ; what can an enemy now do to us ? what can the malice of any mortal effect, o immortal god ?”

(This passage is quoted in the commentary of Gaudapāda on the Sāṅkhya Kārikā, verse 2, and is translated (incorrectly as regards the last clause), by Prof. Wilson, in p. 13 of his English version.)

A curious parallel to this last Vedic text is to be found in the satirical drama of Euripides, the Cyclops, 578 ff. ; though here, of course, the object is merely to depict the drunken elevation of the monster Polyphemus :

'Ο δ' ὀντανός μοι συμμεμιγμένος δοκεῖ
Τῇ γῇ φέρεσθαι, τοῦ Διός τε τὸν θρόνον
Λεύσσω τὸ πᾶν τε δαιμόνων ἄγρινον σέβας.

“The sky, commingled with the earth, appears
To whirl around ; I see the throne of Jove,
And all the awful glory of the gods.”

R. V. ix. 25, 5.—*Arusho janayan girah somah parate āyushag Indrañ gachchan kavikratuh* | “The ruddy Soma, sage, united with men, purifies us, generating hymns, resorting to Indra.”

R. V. ix. 76, 4.— . . . *Pitā matinām asamashta-kāvyah* | “[Soma] father of our hymns, of incomparable wisdom.”

R. V. ix. 95, 2.—*Hariḥ srijanah pathyām ritasya iyartti vācham ariteva nāram* | *devo devānām guhyāni nāma ārishkri-noti barkishi pravāche* | “The golden [Soma] when poured out, sends forth the hymn, [or, his voice], the companion of the ceremony, as a rower propels a boat. A god, he reveals the mysterious names of the gods to the bard upon the sacred grass.” (See R. V. ii. 42, 1, and x. 116, 9, quoted in p. 137).

R. V. ix. 96, 5 (= S. V. ii. 293-5).—*Somah parate janitā matināñ janitā diro janitā prithiryā janitā Agner janitā sūryasya janitā Indrasya janitā uta Vishnoh* | 6. *Brahmā devānām padarīh kavīnām ṛishir riprāñām malisho mrigāñām śyeno gṛidhrāñām svadhitir vanānām somah paritram ati eti rebhan* | 7. *Prāvīvipad vāchah ūrmīñ na sindhur girah somah paramāno manishāh ityādi* | “Soma purifies us, he who is the generator of hymns, of the sky, of the earth, of fire, of the sun, of Indra, and of Vishnu. 6. Soma, who is Brahman among the gods, a leader among the poets, a rishi among sages, a buffalo among wild beasts, a falcon among vultures, an axe amid the forests, advances to the filter with a sound. The purifying soma, like the sea rolling its waves, has poured forth songs, hymns, and thoughts,” etc. (See Benfey’s translation of this passage in his *Sāma-veda*, pp. 238 and 253.)

Varuna.—R. V. viii. 41, 5, 6.—*Yo dhardtā bhuvanānām yausrāñām apīchyā veda nāmāni guhyā* | *sa karīh kāryā puru rūpam dyaur iva pushyati . . .* | *Tasmin risvāni kāryā chakre nābhir iva śritā ityādi* | “He who is the upholder of the worlds (Varuna), who knows the secret and mysterious names of the cows, he, a sage [or poet], cherishes sage [or poetical] works, as the sky does many forms. . . . In him all sage [or poetical]

works abide, as the nave within a wheel," etc. (See R. V. vii. 87, 4, in p. 144, and ix. 95, 2, above, p. 163.)

Varuna, Mitra, and Aryaman.—R. V. vii. 66, 11.—*Vi ye dadhuh śaradam māsam ād ahar yajñam aktum cha ād rīcham anāpyam Varuno Mitrah Aryamā xatrañ rājānah āsata* | “The kings, Varuna, Mitra, and Aryaman, who made the autumn, the month, the day, the sacrifice, night, and the *Rik*, possess an invincible power.”

The following passage of the Rig veda has (as we have seen above, p. 51, note 37; and p. 58), been quoted by Indian commentators and aphorists to prove the eternity of the Veda, on its own authority :

R. V. viii. 64, 6.—*Tasmai nūnam abhidyare vāchā Virūpa nityayā vrishnē chodasra sushtutim* | “Send forth praises, Virūpa, to this heaven-aspiring and prolific Agni, *with perpetual voice.*”

There is, however, no reason whatever to suppose that the words *nityayā vāchā* mean anything more than *perpetual voice*. There is no ground for imagining that the rishi entertained any such conception as became current among the systematic theologians of later times, that his words were eternal. The word *nitya* is used in the same sense “*perpetual*” in R. V. ix. 12, 7 (= S. V. ii. 55, 2), where it is said of Soma, *nityastotro vanaspatis dhīnām antar ityādi* | “The monarch of the woods, *continually-praised*, among the hymns,” etc., as well as in the two following texts :

R. V. ix. 92, 3.—*Somah punānah sadah eti nityam ityādi* | “The pure Soma comes to his *perpetual* abode [or to his abode *continually*],” etc.

R. V. x. 39, 14 (quoted above, p. 132).—*Nityām na sūnum tanayañ dadhānāh* | “Continuing the series like an *unbroken* line of descendants.”

The tenor of the numerous texts adduced in this Section seems

clearly to establish the fact that some at least of the ancient Indian rishis conceived themselves to be prompted and directed, in the composition of their hymns and prayers, by supernatural aid, derived from various deities of their pantheon. It may add force to the proof derived from these texts, and show that I am the less likely to have misunderstood their purport and spirit, if I adduce some evidence that a similar conception was not unknown in another region of the ancient Indo-Germanic world, and that the expressions in which the early Grecian bards laid claim to an inspiration descending from the Muses, or from Apollo, were not mere figures of speech, but significant, originally, of a living belief. Most of the following passages, from Hesiod and Homer, in which this idea is enunciated, are referred to in Mr. Grote's History of Greece, i. 478.

Hesiod, Theogonia, 22 :—

Ἄι νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἔδιδαξαν ἀσιδῆν
 Ἀρνας ποιμαίνονθ' Ἐλικῶνος ὅπο ζαθέοιο.
 Τόνδε δέ με πρώτιστα θεαὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπαν,
 Μοῦσαι Ὄλυμπιδες, κοῦραι Διος ἀγιόχοιο.
 Ποιμένες ἄγραν λοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες διον,
 Ἐδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐπέμοισιν δμοῖα,
 Ἐδμεν δ', ἔντ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι.
 Ὡς ἔφασαν κοῦραι μεγάλου Διος ἀρτιέπειαι·
 Καὶ μοι σκῆπτρον ἔδον, δάφνης ἐριθηλέος δῖον,
 Δρέψασαι θητῶν· ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι ἀνδῆν
 Θείην, ὡς κλείσιμι τὰ τ' ἐσσόμενα, πρό τ' ἐντα,
 Καὶ με κέλονθ' ὑμνεῖν μακάρων γένος ἀνὲν ἐόντων,
 Σφᾶς τ' ἀντὰς πρῶτον τε καὶ ὕστερον ἀνὲν ἀείδειν.

“ Hesiod erst was instructed in beautiful song by the Muses,
 Once as he tended his lambs under glorious Helicon's sunmit.
 Me then the goddesses first, the Olympian Muses, accosted :
 This was the word which those daughters of Jupiter spake in my hearing .
 ‘ Ye who abide in the fields, ye contemptible, glutinous shepherds,
 Full many tales we can tell which are feigned, though they seem to be real ;
 But we are skilled, when we please, to relate the reality also.’
 Thus, very fluent in speech, mighty Jupiter’s daughters addressed me.
 Straightway then plucking a branch of luxuriant laurel, the Muses
 Gave it to me for a staff, and *inspired me with speech superhuman*,
 Fitting me thus to make known both the future and also the bygone.
 Next they enjoined me to hymn the immortals, unchangeably blessed,
 Chiefly, however, to sing their own praises, beginning and ending.”

Hesiod, Theogonia, 94 :—

'Εκ γὰρ Μουσάν καὶ ἐκηθόλου Ἀπόλλωνος
 'Ανδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔστιν ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ κιθαρισταί,
 'Εκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆς.

“ Minstrels who come to this earth, as well as all tuneful musicians,
 Spring from the heavenly Muses, and from the far-darting Apollo :
 Kings are from Jupiter sprung.”

The following are the words in which the author of the Iliad invokes the aid of the Muses, to qualify him for enumerating the generals of the Grecian host (Iliad, ii. 484) :—

Ἐσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ολύμπια δωμάτ' ἔχουσαι,
 Τμεῖς γὰρ θεαὶ ἔστε πάρεστέ τε ἵστε τε πάντα,
 Ήμεῖς δὲ κλέος διον ἀκούομεν ὄνδε τι ίδμεν.

“ Tell to me now, o ye Muses, who dwell in Olympian mansions,
 Ye who are goddesses, present, and knowing all things which befall men,
 Things of which we may hear rumours, but never get accurate knowledge—
 Tell to me who were commanders and chiefs of the Grecian army.”

But the Muses could also take away, as well as impart, the gift of song, as appears from Iliad, ii. 594 ff.

Ἐνθα τε Μοῦσαι
 Ἀντόμεναι Θάμυριν τὸν Θρήικα παῦσαν ἀοιδῆς.
 Στεῦντο γὰρ ἐνχόμενος νικησέμεν, ἐπερ ἂν ἀνταί
 Μοῦσαι ἀείδοιεν, κούραι Διὸς ἀιγιώχοι.
 Αἱ δὲ χολωσάμεναι πηρὸν θέσαν, ἀντὰρ ἀοιδὴν
 Θεοπεσίῃ ἀφέλοντο, καὶ ἐκλέαθον κιθαριστὸν.

“ That was the spot where the Muses
 Thracian Thamyris met, when they stopped his career as a minstrel.
 Boastingly he had affirmed that, if even the heavenly Muses,
 Daughters of Jove, should compete, he would bear off the laurels for singing.
 Hotly indignant, they smote him with blindness, and took away from him
 Minstrelsy, science divine, and his skill in melodious music.”

The following passages from the Odyssey refer to Demodocus, the bard who sang at the court of Alcinous, King of the Phæacians (Odyssey, viii. 43 ff.) :—

Καλέσασθε δε θεῖον ἀοιδόν,
 Δημόδοκον· τῷ γάρ 'ρα θεὸς πέρι δῶκεν ἀοιδήν,
 Τέρπειν, ὥππῃ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνησιν ἀείδειν.

“ And summon Demodocus hither,
 Minstrel divine, whom the god hath endowed with most exquisite science,
 Charming, whenever his spirit impels him to sing for our pleasure.”

Odyssey, viii. 62 ff.—

Κῆρυξ δ' ἐγγύθεν ἥλθεν ἄγων ἐριόρος ἀοιδὸν·
Τὸν πέρι Μοῦν' ἐφίλησε, δίδου δ' ἀγαθὸν τε κακόν τε,
Οφθαλμῶν μὲν ἄμερσε δίδου δῆδειαν ἀοιδὴν.

“Afterward nigh came the herald, conducting the loveable minstrel.
Him the Muse tenderly loved, but she dealt him good mingled with evil;
Eyesight she took from him, while she *assigned him sweet song* in requital.”

Odyssey, viii. 73—

Μοῦσ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀειδέενεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν κ.τ.λ.

“Next the Muse *stirred up* the bard to resound the achievements of heroes.”

A little further on, Ulysses says of Deinodocus (Odyssey, viii. 479 ff.):—

Πᾶσι γὰρ ἀνθρώποισιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀοιδοὶ¹
Τιμῆς ἔμμοροί εἰσι καὶ ἀιδόνις. θυνεκ' ἄρα σφέας
Οιμας Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε, φίλησε δὲ φύλον ἀοιδῶν.

“All men who dwell upon earth stand in awe of, and honour, their minstrels,
Since the Muse *teaches them lays*, and looks on the tribe with affection.”

And again he addresses him thus (Odyssey, viii. 487) :—

Δημόδοκ', ξυχα δή σε βροτῶν ἀνίζομ' ἀπάντων.
Ἡ σέ γε Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε Διὸς πάις, ή σέ γ' Απόλλων.
Λίγην γὰρ κατὰ κόσμον Ἀχαιῶν δίτον ἀείδεις, κ.τ.λ.

“Happy I deem thee, Demodocus, far above all other mortals.
Either the Muse, Jove's daughter, *hath taught thee*, or Phœbus Apollo;
Such the exactness with which thou relatest the fate of the Argives.”³

Phemius, the Ithacan minstrel, thus supplicates Ulysses to spare his life (Odyssey, xxii. 345 ff.):—

Ἄυτῷ τοι μετόπισθ' ἔχος ἔσσεται, ἕικεν ἀοιδόν
Πέφνης, ὃς τε θεῖσις καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀέδω.
Ἄυτοδίδακτος δ' ἔιμι, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν δίμας
Παντολας ἐνέφυσεν.

“Afterward, thou thyself shalt lament if thou slayest the minstrel,—
Me, who sing praise to the gods, and delight mankind with my legends.
Self-instructed am I, but a *god hath implanted* within me
All kinds of narrative lore.”

³ “That is,” says Mr. Grote, “Demodocus has either been inspired as a poet by the muse, or as a prophet by Apollo, for the Homeric Apollo is not the god of *song*. Kalchas, the prophet, receives his inspiration from Apollo, who confers upon him the same knowledge, both of past and future, as the Muses give to Hesiod.” But does not this passage itself (Odyssey viii. 488) show that the Homeric Apollo was the god of *song*, as well as the bestower of prophetic intuition? and do we not learn the same from Iliad, i. 603? In any case, it is quite clear from Theog. 94, quoted above, that Hesiod regarded Apollo in this character.

The early Greeks believed that the gift of prophecy also, as well as that of song, was imparted by the gods to mortals. This appears from the following passage of Homer (*Iliad*, i. 69) :—

Κάλχας Θεστορίδης, διωνοπόλων ὅχ' ἄριστος,
“Ος γῆη τά τ' ἔσντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα, πρό τ' ἔσντα,
Καὶ νήεσσος ἡγήσατ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἰλιον ξισω,
“Ην δὰ μαντοσύνην, τὴν δι πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.

“ Calchas, the great son of Thestor, all other diviners excelling,
Skilled in the present, foreseeing the future, and knowing the bygone ;
Guide of the Grecian gallies from Hellas to Ilion's roadstead,
Thanks to that power of divining which *Phæbus Apollo* imparted.”

It is well argued by Mr. Grote that the early Greeks really believed in the inspiration of their bards by the Muses (History of Greece, i. 477 ff.) :—

“ His [the early Greek's] faith is ready, literal and uninquiring, apart from all thought of discriminating fact from fiction, or of detecting hidden and symbolized meaning : it is enough that what he hears be intrinsically plausible and seductive, and that there be no special cause to provoke doubt. And if indeed there were, the poet overrules such doubts by the holy and all-sufficient authority of the Muse, whose omniscience is the warrant for his recital, as her inspiration is the cause of his success. The state of mind, and the relation of speaker to hearers, thus depicted, stand clearly marked in the terms and tenor of the ancient epic, if we only put a plain meaning upon what we read. The poet—like the prophet, whom he so much resembles—sings under heavenly guidance, inspired by the goddess to whom he has prayed for her assisting impulse. She puts the word into his mouth and the incidents into his mind ; he is a privileged man, chosen as her organ, and speaking from her revelations. As the Muse grants the gift of song to whom she will, so she sometimes in her anger snatches it away, and the most consummate human genius is then left silent and helpless. It is true that these expressions, of the Muse inspiring,

and the poet singing, a tale of past times, have passed from the ancient epic to compositions produced under very different circumstances, and have now degenerated into unmeaning forms of speech ; but they gained currency originally in their genuine and literal acceptation. If poets had from the beginning written or recited, the predicate of singing would never have been ascribed to them ; nor would it ever have become customary to employ the name of the Muse as a die to be stamped on licensed fiction, unless the practice had begun when her agency was invoked and hailed in perfect good faith. Belief, the fruit of deliberate inquiry, and a rational scrutiny of evidence, is in such an age unknown ; the simple faith of the time slides in unconsciously, when the imagination and feeling are exalted ; and inspired authority is at once understood, easily admitted, and implicitly confided in."

If we extend our researches over the pages of Homer, we shall speedily discover numerous other instances of divine interference in human affairs, not merely (1) in the *general* government of the world, in the distribution of good and evil, and the allotment of the diversified gifts, intellectual, moral, and physical, which constitute the innumerable varieties of *human* condition, but also (2) in the way of *special* suggestion, guidance, encouragement, and protection, afforded to individuals.

Illustrations of the general control exercised by the gods over the fortunes of mankind may be found in the following passages of the Iliad, xiii. 730 ff., and of the Odyssey, i. 347 f.; iv. 236 f.; vi. 188 f.; viii. 167-175; xvii. 218, 485 ff.

The following are illustrations of the *special* interference of the gods in behalf of their favourites :—Iliad, i. 194 ff., 218 ; iii. 380 ff. ; v. 1 ff. ; vii. 272 ; xiii. 60 f., 435 ; xvi. 788 ff. :—Odyssey, i. 319 ff. ; iii. 26 ff. ; xiv. 216 f., 227 ; xvi. 159 ff.⁴ Of the latter class of passages, I quote two specimens.

⁴ Compare Prof. Blackie's dissertation on the theology of Homer in the "Classical Museum," vol. vii. pp. 414 ff.

Odyssey, i. 319 ff.—

'Η μὲν ἄρ σε εἰποῦσα ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη,
 "Ορνις δ' ὡς ἀνοτάναι διέπτατο" τῷ δὲν θυμῷ
 Θῆκε μένος καὶ θάρσους, ὑπέμνησέν τέ ἐ πατρός
 Μᾶλλον ἔτ' ἦ τὸ πάροιθεν δὲ φρεσὶν ἥσι νοῆσας
 Θάμβησεν κατὰ θυμόν, δίστατο γὰρ θεὸν ξιναῖ.

"Thus having spoken, the goddess, the keen-eyed Athene departed,
 Flying aloft like a bird, unobserved : but to him she *implanted*
Courage and strength in his soul, and reminded him then of his father
 Far more strongly than ever : he then, perceiving the marvel,
 Wondered exceedingly, thinking a god must have been his adviser.

When Telemachus urges his youth and inexperience as a reason for diffidence in approaching Nestor, Minerva says to him (Odyssey iii. 26) :—

Τηλέμαχ', ἄλλα μὲν ἀντὸς ἐν φρεσὶ σῆσι νοῆσεις,
 "Αλλὰ δὲ καὶ δαίμων ὑποθέσεται· δύ γὰρ οἴω
 "Οὐ σε θεῶν ἀέκητι γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε.

" Some things thou thyself shalt perceive in thine own understanding ;
 Others, again, some god will suggest to thy spirit, for never
 Hast thou been born, or bred up, except by celestial permission."

These passages, however, afford only one exemplification of the idea which runs through, and in fact, created, the entire mythology of the Greeks, viz., that all the departments of life and of nature were animated, controlled, and governed by particular deities, by whom they were represented, and in whom they were personified.

The Indian mythology,—as is evident to every reader of the Vedas, as well as (to some extent) to the student of the Puranas,—is distinguished by the same tendency as the Grecian. Indra, Agni, Vāyu, Varuna, Sūrya, and many other gods are nothing else than personifications of the elements, while Vāch or Sarasvatī and some other deities, represent either the divine reason by which the more gifted men were supposed to be inspired, or some mental function, or ceremonial abstraction.

In the later religious history, however, of the two races, the Hellenic and the Indian, there is in one respect a remarkable divergence. Though the priestesses of the different oracles,

and perhaps some other pretenders to prophetical intuition, were popularly regarded as speaking by a divine impulse,⁵ the idea of inspiration as attaching to poems or other compositions of a religious, didactic, or philosophical character, very soon became extinct. The Greeks had no sacred Scriptures. Their philosophers spoke and wrote in dependance on their own reason alone. They never professed to be guided by any supernatural assistance, nor claimed any divine authority for their dogmas. Nor was any such character of infallibility ever claimed for any of them by their successors.

In India, on the other hand, the indistinct, and perhaps hesitating, belief which some of the ancient rishis seem to have entertained in their own inspiration was not suffered to die out in the minds of later generations. On the contrary this belief grew up by degrees into a fixed persuasion that all the literary productions of those early sages had not only resulted from a supernatural impulse, but were infallible, divine, and even eternal. These works have become the sacred Scriptures of India. And in the popular opinion, if not in the estimation of the learned, most Indian works of any importance, of a religious, scientific, or philosophical kind, which were produced at a later period, have come to be regarded as inspired, as soon as the lapse of ages had removed the writers beyond familiar or traditional knowledge, and invested their names with a halo of reverence.

To return from this digression to the inquiry which was being pursued regarding the opinions of the ancient Vedic rishis on the subject of their own inspiration :

How, it will be asked, are we to reconcile this impression which the rishis manifest of being prompted by supernatural aid, with the circumstance, which seems to be no less distinctly proved by the citations made in the preceding section (pp. 128, 136), that they frequently speak of themselves as having *made, fabricated, or generated* the hymns, without apparently betray-

⁵ See Nagelsbach's Nachhomeriche Theologie, pp. 173 ff.

ing any consciousness that in this process they were inspired or guided by any extraneous assistance?

I am not in a position to attempt any very precise explanation of this discrepancy. I will only suggest (1) that possibly the idea of inspiration may not have been held by the earliest rishis, but may have grown up among their successors; or (2) that it may have been entertained by some rishis, and not by others; or again (3), if both ideas can be traced to the same author (as is possibly the case in R. V. i. 109, 1, 4), we may suppose that the one notion was uppermost in his mind at one moment, and the other at another; or (4) that he had no very clearly defined ideas of inspiration, and might conceive that the divine assistance of which he was conscious, or which at least he implored, did not render his hymn the less truly the production of his own mind; that, in short, the superhuman and human elements were not incompatible with one another.

The first of these suppositions is, however, attended with this difficulty, that both conceptions, viz., that of independent unassisted composition, and that of inspiration, appear to be discoverable in all parts of the Rig-veda. As regards the second supposition, it might not be easy (in the uncertainty attaching to the Vedic tradition contained in the Anukramani or Vedic index) to show that such and such hymns were written by such and such rishis, rather than by any others. It may, however, become possible by continued and careful comparison of the Vedic hymns, to arrive at some probable conclusions in regard to their authorship, so far at least as to determine that particular hymns should probably be assigned to particular eras, or families, rather than to others. I must, however, leave such investigations to be worked out, and the results applied to the present subject, by more competent scholars than myself.

III.—While in many passages of the Veda, an efficacy is ascribed to the hymns, which is perhaps nothing greater than natural religion teaches all men to attribute to their devotions, in other texts a mystical, magical, or supernatural power is

represented as residing in the prayers and metres. (See Weber's *Vājasaneyi-Sanhītā* specimen, p. 61.)

Thus in R. V. i. 67, 3, it is said: *Ajo na xāñ dādhāra prithivīñ tastambha dyām mantrebhīḥ satyaiḥ* | “(Agni) who like the unborn, supported the broad earth, and upheld the sky by true prayers.” The following is part of Sāyana’s annotation on this verse: *Mantrair divo dhāraṇāñ Taittiriye samāmnā-tāñ* | “*devā vā ādityasya svarga-lokasya parācho’tipātād abibhayuh* | *tañ chhandobhir adrihan dhrityā*” *iti* | *yadvā satyair mantraiḥ stūyamāno’gnir dyāñ tastambha iti* | “The supporting of the sky by mantras is thus recorded in the Taittiriya: ‘The gods feared lest the sun and the heaven should fall down; they propped them up by metres.’ Or the verse may mean that Agni, being lauded by true mantras, upheld the sky.”

R. V. i. 164, 25.—*Jagatā sindhuñ divi astabhāyad rathantare sūryam pari apaśyat* | *gāyatrasya samidhas tisra āhus tato mahnā pra ririche mahatrā* | “By the Jagatī metre he fixed the waters in the sky; he beheld the sun in the Rathantara (a portion of the Sūma-veda): there are said to be three divisions of the Gāyatrī; hence it surpasses [all others] in power and grandeur.”

R. V. iii. 53, 12.—*Visvāmitrasya raxati brahma idam Bhāratāñ janam* | “The prayer of Visvāmitra protects this tribe of the Bharatas.”

R. V. v. 31, 4.—*Brahmāñna Indram mahayanto arkair avar-dhayan Ahaye hantavai u* | “The priests magnifying Indra by their praises, have fortified him for slaying Agni.”

R. V. v. 40, 6.— . . . *Gūlham sūryāñ tamasā apavratarena turīyenā brahmanā avindad Atriḥ* | v. 8. . . . *Atriḥ sūryasya divi chaxur ādhāt svarbhānor apa māyā aghuxat* | v. 9. *Yāñ vai sūryāñ svarbhānus tamasā avidhyad āsurah* | *Atrayas tam anvavindan na hi anye ásaknuran* | “Atri, by his fourth prayer, discovered the sun which had been concealed by an unholy darkness. 8. . . . Atri placed the eye of the sun in the sky, and hid the delusions of Svarbhānu. 9. The Atris discovered

the sun, which Svarbhānu, of the Asura race, had pierced; no other could [effect this].”

R. V. vi. 75, 19.— . . . *Devās tuṁ sarve dhūrvantu brahma varma mamāntaram* | “May all the gods destroy him; the prayer is my protecting armour.”

R. V. vii. 19, 11.—*Nu Indra śūra stavamānah ūtī brahma-jutas tanvā rāvridhasva ityādi* | “Heroic Indra, lauded with devotion, and impelled by our prayers, grow in body,” etc.

R. V. vii. 33, 3.— . . . *Eren nu kaṁ dāśarājñe Sudāsam prāvad Indro brahmaṇā vo Vasishthāḥ* | 5. . . . *Vasishthasya stuvataḥ Indraḥ asrod urum Tritsubhyāḥ akriṇod u lokam* | “Indra has delivered Südās in the combat of the ten kings through your prayer, Vasishtha. 5. Indra heard Vasishtha when he praised, and opened a wide place for the Tritsus.”

R. V. viii. 15, 7 (= S. V. ii. 995).—*Tara tyad indriyam brihat tura śushmam uta kratum vajram sisatī dhishanā varcṇam* | “The hymn sharpens thy great strength, thy vigour, thy force, [and thy] glorious thunderbolt.”

(This verse is translated by Benfey, S. V. p. 286, who, in a note, thus describes the doctrine of the hymns: “Prayer sharpens the thunderbolt, and consequently Indra’s might; for the power, etc., of all the gods is derived from the sacrifices and prayers of men.”)

R. V. viii. 49, 9.—*Pāhi naḥ Agne c̄kayā pāhi uta dvitīyayā pāhi gīrbhis tisribhir ūrjāmpate pāhi chatasribhir vaso* | “Protect us, Agni, through the first, protect us through the second, protect us, lord of power, through three hymns, protect us through four, thou gracious one.”

The following passage celebrates the numbers of the metres:

R. V. x. 114, 8, 9.—*Sahasrudhā pañchadasāni ukthā yāvad dyārā-prithirī tāvad it tat* | *Sahasradhā mahimānaḥ sahasraṁ yāvad brahma tāvatī vāk* | *kaś chhandasāṁ yogam āveda dhīrah ko dhishnyām prati vācham papāda* | *kam ritvijām ashṭamāṁ śūram āhur hari Indrasya ni chikāya kah svit* | “There are a thousand times fifteen ukthas; that extends [they extend?] as

far as heaven and earth. A thousand times a thousand are the glorifications; speech is commensurate with devotion. What sage knows the [whole] series [or application] of the metres? Who has obtained all the forms of devotional speech? Whom do they call the eighth hero among priests? Who has perceived the two steeds of Indra?"

(The word *dhisanya* is said by Yāska, Nirukta, viii. 3, to be = to *dīshanya*, and that again to be = to *dīshānābhava*, "springing" from *dīshānā*, "speech," or "sacred speech."

I conclude the series of texts relating to the power of the mantras by quoting the whole of the 130th hymn of the 10th Mandala of the R. V.: *Yo yajño rīvatas tantubhis tataḥ ekaśataṁ devakarmeḥ śāyataḥ | imē rayanti pitaro ye ḥayayuh pravāya apa vaya āśate tate | 2. Pumān enām tanute utkriṇattī pumān vi tatne adhi nāke asmin | imē mayūkhā upa shedur ū sadah sāmāni chakrus tasarāni otave | 3. Kā āśit pramā pratimā kiṁ nidānam ājyam kiṁ āśit paridhīḥ ka āśit | chhandaḥ kiṁ āśit prāugaṁ kiṁ uktham yad devā devam ayajanta vis̄ve | 4. Agner gāyatrī abhavat sayugrā ushñihayā Savitā sambabhūva | anushtubhā Somah ukthair mahasvān Brihaspater brihatī vācham āvat | 5. Virāṇ Mitrāvaraṇayor abhiśrīr Indrasya trishtub iha bhāgah ahnaḥ | Viśvān devān jagatī āviveśa tena chākli ripre rishayo manushyāḥ | 6. Chākli ripre tena rishayo manushyā yajñe jāte pitaraḥ nah purāne | paśyan manye manasā chaxasā tān ye imāṁ yajñam ayajante pūrve | 7. Sahastomāḥ sahachandasah āvritah sahapramāḥ rishayah sapta daivyāḥ | pūrveshām panthām anudriṣya dhīrā anvālebhire rathyo na raśmīn | "The [web of] sacrifice which is stretched on every side with threads, which is extended with one hundred [threads], the work of the gods,—these fathers who have arrived weave it; they sit where it is extended, [saying?] 'weave forwards, weave backwards.' The Man stretches it out and spins it, the Man has extended it over this sky. These rays [rishis?] approached the place of sacrifice; they made the Sāma verses the shuttles for the woof. What was the order [of the ceremonial], what the dispo-*

sition, what the service, what the offering, what the enclosure, what the metre, what the preliminary chaunt, and what the hymn, when all the gods sacrificed to the god [or, offered up the god as a victim]? The *gāyatrī* was produced as the [metre] attendant upon Agni; Savitri appeared with the *ushṇih*; and Soma, glorious through hymns (*ukthas*), with the *anushtubh*; the *bṛihatī* preferred the voice of Bṛihaspati. The *virāt* attached itself to Mitra and Varuna; the *trishṭubh*, assigned to [?] the day, [accompañed] Indra. The *jagatī* entered into the Viśvedevas. By this means men were made rishis, [or rishis and men were formed]. By this means our mortal fathers were made rishis, when this ancient sacrifice was celebrated. Beholding, I know [or I believe I behold] with my mind, [as] an eye, those ancients who performed this sacrifice. The seven divine rishis, with hymns, with metres, [with] ritual forms, and with the prescribed arrangements, steadily contemplating the path of the ancients, have, like chariotteers, followed after the rays."

(I shall not attempt to explain the meaning and purport of all the parts of this mystical hymn. The precise signification of some of the terms relating to the ceremonial of sacrifice in verse 3, is not supplied in any work to which I have access. In the rendering of those to which I refer, Mr. Colebrooke, who has translated the passage (Essays, i. 34, 35, or p. 18 of W. and N.'s ed.) differs from M. Langlois. My object in quoting the hymn is to show how the various metres are associated with the different deities, in this primeval and mysterious rite, and how a certain sanctity of character is thus imparted to them. The Atharva-veda (x. 7, 43, 44) gives the second verse somewhat differently from the R. V., as follows: *Pumān enad vayati udgrinatti pumān enad vi jabhāra adhi nāke | ime mayūkhā upa tastabhur divāñ sāmāni chakrus tasaranī vātave |* "The Man weaves and spins this: the Man has spread this over the sky. These rays have propped up the sky; they have made the Sāma verses shuttles for the woof.")

IV.—But whatever may have been the nature or the source of the supernal illumination to which the rishis laid claim, it is quite clear that some among them at least made no pretensions to anything like a perfect knowledge of all subjects, human and divine, as they occasionally confess their ignorance of matters in which they felt a deep interest and curiosity. This is shown in the following texts :

R. V. i. 164, 5.—*Pākah pṛichchhāmi manusā avijānan devā-nām enā nihitā padāni | ratse bashkaye adhī saptā tantūn ri tatnire karayah otarai ū |* 6. *Achikitrān chikitasaś chid atra kavīn pṛichchhāmi ridmane na vidrān | ei yas tastambhu shal imā rujānsi ajasya rūpe kim api srid ekam |* 37. *Na ri jānāmi yad ira idam asmi nīyak sunnaddho manusā charāmi | yadā mā āgan prathamajāḥ ritasya ād id eāchah aśnure bhāgam asyāḥ |* “In immature, not knowing in my mind, I enquire : these [are] the hidden or treasured truths [or abodes] of the gods ; the sages have stretched out seven threads for a woof over the yearling calf [or over the sun, the abode of all things]. Not comprehending, I ask those sages who comprehend this matter ; unknowing, [I ask] that I may know ; what is the one thing, in the form of the uncreated, who has upheld these six worlds ? 37. I do not recognize if I am like this ; I go on perplexed and bound in mind. When the first-born sons of sacrifice [or truth] come to me, then I enjoy a share of that word.”

(I do not attempt to explain the proper sense of these obscure and mystical verses. It is sufficient for my purpose that they clearly express ignorance on the part of the speaker. Prof. Wilson's translation of the passages may be compared. Prof. Müller, *Anc. Ind. Lit.*, p. 567, renders verse 37 as follows :—“I know not what this is that I am like ; turned inward I walk, chained in my mind. When the first-born of time comes near me, then I obtain the portion of this speech.”)

R. V. x. 88, 18.—*Kati agnayah kati sūryāsah kati ushasah kati u srid āpah | na upaspījañ rah pitaro vadāmi pṛichchhāmi*

vah kavayo vidmanc kam | “How many fires are there? how many suns? how many dawns? how many waters? I do not, fathers, say this to you in jest; I really ask you, sages, in order that I may know.”

R. V. x. 129, 5.—*Tiraśčlno vitato rāśmir eshām adhaḥ svid
āśid upari svid āśit | retodhā āsan mahimāna āsan svadhā ava-*
stat prayatih parastāt | 6. Kah addhā veda kah iha pravochat
kutah ājātā kutah iyam visrishtih | arvāg devā asya visarjanena
athā ko veda yataḥ ābabhūra | 7. Iyam visrishtir yataḥ āba-
bhūva yadi vā dadhe yadi vā na | yah asya adhyaxah paramē
vyoman sa anya veda yadi vā na veda | “Their ray, obliquely extended, was it below, or was it above? There were generative sources, and there were great powers, svadhā (nature) below; and effort above. Who knows, who hath here declared whence this creation was produced, whence [it came]? The gods were subsequent to the creation of this universe; who then knows whence it sprang? Whence this creation sprang, whether it was formed or not,—He who, in the highest heavens, is the overseer of this universe,—he indeed knows, or he does not know.”

(The last verse may also be rendered, “He from whom this creation sprang,—whether he made it or not,—he who is the overseer of this universe, he knows, or he does not know.” See the translation of the whole hymn by Mr. Colebrooke in his Essays, i. 33, 34, or p. 17 of W. and N.’s ed. See also Prof. Müller’s translation and comment in pp. 559-564 of his History of Anc. Sanskrit Lit.)

We have seen (above, p. 45) that a claim is set up (by some unknown writer quoted by Sāyana) on behalf of the Veda that it can impart an understanding of all things, past and future, subtle, proximate, and remote; and that according to Sankara Āchāryya (on the Brāhma sutras, i. 1, 3) as cited above, p. 52, note, the knowledge which it manifests, approaches to omniscience. All such proud pretensions are, however, plainly enough disavowed by the rishis who uttered the complaints of ignorance

which I have just adduced. It is indeed urged by Sāyana (see above, pp. 45, 46) in answer to the objection, that passages like R. V. x. 129, 5, 6, can possess no authority as sources of knowledge, since they express doubt,—that this is not their object, but that it rather is to intimate by a figure of speech the extreme profundity of the Divine essence, and the great difficulty which any persons not well versed in the sacred writings must experience in comprehending it. There can, however, be little doubt that the authors of the passages I have cited did feel their own ignorance and intended to give utterance to this feeling. As, however, such confessions of ignorance on the part of the rishis, if admitted, would have been incompatible with the doctrine that the Veda was an infallible source of divine knowledge, it became necessary for the later theologians who held that doctrine to deny, or explain away, the plain sense of those expressions.

It should be noticed that these confessions of ignorance and fallibility are by no means inconsistent with the supposition that the rishis may have conceived themselves to be animated and directed in the composition of their hymns by a divine impulse. Though the two rivals, Vasishtha and Viśvāmitra, to enhance their own importance, and recommend themselves to their royal patrons, talk proudly about the wide range of their knowledge (see above, pp. 142-144), it is not necessary to imagine that, either in their idea or in that of the other ancient Indian sages (any more than in that of the Grecian bards), inspiration and infallibility were convertible or co-extensive terms. Both the Greek minstrel and the Indian rishi may have believed that they received, indeed, such supernatural aid as enabled them to perform what they must otherwise have left unattempted, but which after all resulted in only a partial illumination, and left them still liable to mistake and doubt.

I must also remark that this belief in their own inspiration which I imagine the rishis to have held, falls very far short of the conceptions which later writers, whether Naiyāyika, Mīmāṃsaka, or Vedantist, entertain in regard to the supernatural origin

and authority of the Veda. The gods from whom the rishis supposed that they derived their illumination, at least Agni, Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Soma, Pūshan, etc., would all fall under the category of *productions*, or divinities created *in time*. This is clearly shown by the comments of Śankara on the Brahma Sūtras, i. 3, 28 (above, pp. 69, 70). But if these gods were themselves *created*, and even (as we are told in the Rig-veda itself, x. 129, 6, cited in p. 178) produced *subsequently* to some other parts of the *creation*, the hymns with which they inspired the rishis, could not have been *eternal*. The only one of the deities referred to in the Rig-veda as sources of illumination, to whom this remark would perhaps not apply, is Vāch or Sarasvatī, who is identified with the supreme Brahma in the passage of the Vrihad Aranyaka Upanishad quoted above (p. 108, note 53); though this idea probably originated subsequently to the era of the hymns. But it is not to *created* gods, like Agni, Indra, and others of the same class, that the origin of the Veda is referred by the Naiyāyikas, Mīmāṃsakas, or Vedantists. The Naiyāyikas represent the *eternal* Iśvara as the author of the Veda; at least, this is the opinion of Udayana Acharyya, the writer of the Kusumānjali (in the passages which I shall quote in the Appendix in a note on p. 81). And the Mīmāṃsakas and Vedantists, as we have seen (pp. 52-73, and note 39, pp. 51, 52), either affirm that the Veda is uncreated, or derive it from the eternal Brahma. Their view, consequently (unless we admit an exception in reference to Vāch), differs from that of the Vedic rishis themselves, who do not seem to have had any idea, either of their hymns being *uncreated*, or of their being derived from the eternal Brahma.

As regards the relation of the rishis to deities like Indra, it is also deserving of notice that later mythologists represent the former, not only as quite independent of the latter, and as gifted with an inherent capacity of raising themselves by their own austerities to the enjoyment of various superhuman faculties, but even as possessing the power of rivalling the gods them-

selves, and taking possession of their thrones. See the stories of Nahusha and Viśvāmitra in the First Part of this work, particularly pp. 68, 103, and 108. Compare also the passages from the Rig-veda, x. 154, 2, and x. 167, 1, quoted above, p. 146, where the rishis are said to have attained to heaven, and Indra to have conquered it, by devotion (*tapas*).

SECT. V.—*Texts from the Upanishads, showing the opinions of the authors regarding their own inspiration, or that of their predecessors.*

I shall now adduce some passages from the different Upanishads, to show what opinions their authors entertained either in regard to their own inspiration, or that of the earlier sages, from whom they assert that their doctrine was derived by tradition.

I. Śvetāśvatara Up. v. 2 (already quoted above, p. 96).—*Yo yonin yonim adhitishthaty eko visrāni rūpāni yoniścha sarvāḥ
rishim prasūtaṁ Kapilaṁ yas tam agre jñānair bibharti jāyamānañcha paśyet* | “He who alone presides over every place of production, over all forms, and all sources of birth, who formerly nourished with various knowledge that rishi Kapila, who had been born, and beheld him at his birth.”

II. Śvetāśvatara Up. vi. 21.—*Tapah-prabhāvād veda-prasādāchcha Brhma ha Śvetāśvataro 'tha ridoān | atyāśramibhyah
paramam pavitram procācha samyag rishi-saṅghajushtam* | “By the power of austerity, and by the grace of the Veda, the wise Śvetāśvatara declared perfectly to the men in the highest of the four orders, the supreme and holy Brhma, who is sought after by the company of rishis.” (Dr. Röer’s translation, p. 68, follows the commentator in rendering the first words of the verse thus: “By the power of his austerity, and the grace of God.” This, however, is not the literal meaning of the words *veda-prasādāchcha*, a reading the correctness of which is not denied.)

III. Mundaka Up. i. 1 ff. (quoted above, p. 18, more at

length).—*Brahmā devānām prathamāḥ sambabhūva viśvasya
karītā bhuvanasya goptā | Sa brahma-vidyāṁ sarva-vidyā-pra-
tishṭhām Atharvāya jyeshṭha-putrāya prāha |* “Brahma was born the first of the gods, he who is the maker of the universe and the supporter of the world. He declared the science of Brahma, the foundation of all the sciences, to Atharva, his eldest son.”

IV. Chhandogya Up. p. 625 ff.—*Tad ha etad Brahmā Prajā-
pataye uvācha Prajāpatir Manave Manuḥ prajābhyaḥ | āchāryya-
kulād redam adhītya yathā ridhānaṁ guroḥ harmatiṣeṣhenā
abhisamāvr̥itya kuṭumbe śuchau dēśe svādhyāyam adhīyāno
dhārmikān ridadhād ātmāni sarrendriyāṇi sampratishṭhāpya
ahiṁsan sarra-bhūtāni anyatra tīrthebhyaḥ sa khalv evāṁ varita-
yan yāvadāyusham Brahma-lokam abhisampadyate na cha punar
āvarattate na cha punar āvarattate |* “This [doctrine] Brahma declared to Prajāpati, Prajāpati declared it to Manu, and Manu to his descendants. Having received instruction in the Veda from the family of his religious teacher in the prescribed manner, and in the time which remains after performing his duty to his preceptor; and when he has ceased from this, continuing his religious studies at home, in his family, in a pure spot, communicating a knowledge of duty [to young men], withdrawing all his senses into himself, doing injury to no living creature, away from holy places [?], thus passing all his days, a man attains to the world of Brahma, and does not return again, and does not return again, [*i.e.*, is not subjected to any future births].”

I quote the commencement of Śankara's comment on this passage: *Tad ha etad ātma-jñānaṁ sopakaraṇam om ity etad
axaram ityādyaiḥ saha upāsanais tadrāchakena granthena ash-
ṭādhyāya-laxaṇena saha Brahmā Hiranyagarbhaḥ Parameś-
varo rā taddvārcena Prajāpataye Kaśyapāya uvācha | asāv api
Manare srāputrāya | Manuḥ prajābhyaḥ | ityevam śruti-artha-
sampradāya-paramparayā āgatam upanishad-vijñānam adyāpi
vidvatsv avagamyate |* “This knowledge of soul, with its instruments, with the sacred monosyllable *om* and other formulæ of

devotion, and with the book distinguished as containing eight chapters, which sets forth all these topics, [viz., the Chhāndogya Upanishad itself] was declared by Brahmā Hiranyagarbha, or by Paramesvara (the supreme God), through his agency, to the Prajāpati Kasyapa. The latter in his turn declared it to his son Manu, and Manu to his descendants. In this manner the sacred knowledge contained in the Upanishads, having been received through successive transmission of the sense of the Veda from generation to generation, is to this day understood among learned men."

A P P E N D I X.

NOTE I. on Page 19, Line 2.

I ADDUCE here some further passages from Indian authors in addition to those already cited in pp. 17-19, which deprecate the ceremonial, or exoteric parts of the Vedas, in comparison with the esoteric knowledge of Brahma.

I. My attention has been drawn to the following passage of the Bhagavad Gītā, ii. 42 ff., by its quotation in an (as yet) unpublished work on Hindu Philosophy by the Rev. Professor K. M. Banerjea, of Calcutta : *Yām imām pushpitāñ vācham prava-danty avipaschitah | veda-vādu-ratāḥ pārtha nānyad astīti vādi-nah | kāmātmānah svarga-parāḥ janma-karma-phala-prudām | kriyā-viśeṣha-bahulām bhogaīsvarya-gatim prati | bhogaīsvarya-prasaktānām tayā 'pahṛita-chetasām | eyarasāyātmikā buddhiḥ samādhau na vidhiyate | traiguṇya-vishayā redā nistraiguṇyo bhavārjuna | . . . yācān artha udapāne sarvataḥ sumplutodake | tāvān sarreshu vedeshu brāhmaṇasya rījānataḥ |* “A flowery doctrine (promising future births and the reward of works, prescribing numerous ceremonies, with a view to future gratification and glory) is preached by unlearned men, devoted to the injunctions of the Veda, assertors of its exclusive importance, sensual in disposition, and seekers after paradise. The restless minds of the men who, through this [flowery doctrine], have become bereft of wisdom, and are ardent in the pursuit of future enjoyment and glory, are not applied to contemplation. The Vedas have for their objects the three qualities (*sattrā*,

rajas, tamas, or ‘goodness,’ ‘passion,’ and ‘darkness’); but be thou, Arjuna, free from these three qualities.... As great as is the use of a well which is surrounded on every side by overflowing waters, so great [and no greater?] is the use of the Vedas to a Brahman endowed with true knowledge.”

II. Chhāndogya Up. p. 473 (Colebrooke's Essays, i. 12).—
*Adhīhi bhagara iti ha upasasāda Sanatkumārañ Nāradah | tam
 ha uvācha yad vetttha tena mā upasīda tatas te ūrddhvam
 vaxyāmi iti | sa ha uvācha rigvedam bhagavo 'dhyemi yajurvedam
 sāma-vedam ātharvanañ chaturtham itihāsa-purānam pañcha-
 mañ vedānām vedam pitryam rāśim daivam nidhiñ vākorāk-
 yam ekāyanam dera-vidyām brahma-vidyām bhūta-vidyām xatra-
 ridyām naxatra-vidyām sarpa-dera-jana-vidyām etad bhagavo
 'dhyemi | so 'ham bhagavo mantra-vid crāsmi na ātma-vit |
 śrutiñ hy eva me bhagavattdriśebhyas 'tarati śokam ātma-vid'
 iti so 'ham bhagavah śochāmi tam mā bhagavān śokasya pāram
 tārayatv iti | tam ha uvācha yad vai kiñcha etad adhyagīshthā
 nāma evaitat | nāma vā rigvedo yajur-vedah sāmaveda āthar-
 vanas' chaturtha itihāsa-purānah pañchamo vedānām vedah
 pitryo rāśir daivo nidhir vākorākyam ekāyanam deva-vidyā
 brahma-vidyā bhūta-vidyā xatra-vidyā naxatra-vidyā sarpa-deva-
 jana-vidyā nāma evaitad nāma upāsva iti | sa yo nāma brahma
 ity upāste yāvad nāmno gatañ tatra asya yathā kāmachāro
 bhavati yo nāma brahma ity upāste | asti bhagavo nāmno bhūya
 iti | nāmno vāva bhūyo 'sti iti | tan me bhagavān bravītv iti |*

“Nārada approached Sanatkumāra, saying, ‘Instruct me, venerable sage.’ He received for answer, ‘Approach me with [*i.e.*, tell me] that which thou knowest; and I will declare to thee whatever more is to be learnt.’ Nārada replied, ‘I am instructed, venerable sage, in the Rig-veda, the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, the Ātharvana, [which is] the fourth, the Itihāsas and Puranas, [which are] the fifth Veda of the Vedas, the rites of the pitris, arithmetic, the knowledge of portents, and of great periods, the art of reasoning, ethics, interpretation, the knowledge of Scripture, demonology, the science of war, the

knowledge of the stars, the sciences of serpents and deities ; this is what I have studied. I, venerable man, *know only the hymns (mantras)*; while I am ignorant of soul. But I have heard from reverend sages like yourself that “the man who is acquainted with soul overpasses grief.” Now I, venerable man, am afflicted ; but do thou conduct me across my grief.’ Sanatkumāra answered, ‘That which thou hast studied is nothing but *name*. The Rig-veda is *name* ; and so are the Yajur-veda, the Sāma-veda, the Ātharvana, the fourth, and the Itihāsas and Puranas, the fifth Veda of the Vedas, etc. [all the other branches of knowledge are here enumerated just as above],—all these are but *name*: worship the *name*. He who worships a *name* with the persuasion that it is Brahma, holds as it were a dominion at his will over all which that *name* comprehends ;—such is the prerogative of him who worships *name* with the persuasion that it is Brahma.’ ‘Is there anything, venerable man,’ asked Nārada, ‘which is more than *name*? ’ ‘There is,’ he replied, ‘something more than *name*? ’ ‘Tell it to me,’ rejoined Nārada.”

(Sankara interprets the words *pañchamañ redānāñ vedam* differently from what I have done. He separates the words *redānāñ vedam* from *pañchamam* and makes them to mean *the means of knowing the Vedas*, i.e., grammar. See above, p. 107.)

III. Brīhadāraṇyaka Up. iv. 3, 22 (p. 792 ff., p. 228-9 of Dr. Röer’s English).—*Atra pitā apitā bhavati mātā amātā lokā alokā devā aderā vedā aredāḥ | atra steno ’steno bhavati bhrūna-hā abhrūna-hā chāndālo ’chāndālah paulkaso ’paulkasah śramaṇo ’sramanaś tāpaso ’tāpaso nanvāgatam punyena ananvāgatam pāpena tīrno hi tadā sarvān śokān hṛidayasya bhavati |* “In that [condition of transcendental knowledge] a father is no father, a mother is no mother, the worlds are no worlds, the gods are no gods, and the Vedas are no Vedas. In that condition a thief is no thief, a murderer of embryos is no murderer of embryos, a Chāndāla no Chāndāla, a Paulkasa no Paulkasa, a Śramaṇa no Śramaṇa, a devotee no devotee ; the saint has

then no relation either to merit or sin; for he then crosses over all griefs of the heart."

(I quote Śankara's explanation of the unusual words *nancāgata* and *anānṛāgata*: *Nancāgatam na anṛāgatam ananeāgatam asambodhīham ity etat puṇyena śāstra-rihitena karmāṇā tathā pāpēna rihitākaraṇa-pratishiddha-kriyā-laxayenā | "Nanṛāgata, i.e., na (not) anṛāgata, or anānṛāgata, i.e., asambodhī. This condition is unconnected either with merit, i.e., action enjoined by the śāstra, or with sin, i.e., action distinguished as the neglect of what is enjoined, or the doing of what is forbidden."*)

IV. To the same effect the great sage Nārada is made to speak in the Bhāgavata Pur. iv. 29, 42 ff.: *Prajāpati-patiḥ sārād bhagārān Giriśo Manih | Darādayah prajādhya-xā naishthikāḥ Sanakādayah | Marīchīr Atryangirasaū Pulastyah Pulahāḥ Kratuḥ | Bhṛigur Vasishtha ity etc mud-antā brahma-rādinah | adyāpi vāchaspata-yas tapo-vidyā-samādhībhīḥ | paśyanto 'py na paśyanti paśyantam Parameśvaraṁ | śabda-brahmaṇī dushpāre charanta ururistare | mantra-lingair iyarakchinnam bhajanto na ciduh param | yadā yasyānugrihnāti bhagārān ātma-bhāvitah | sa jahāti matīm loke rede cha pari-nishthitām | tasmāt karmasu varhishmann ajanānād artha-kāśishu | mā 'rtha-drishtim kṛithāḥ śrotra-sparśishv aśprishta-ras-tushu | sva-lokaṁ na vidus te rai yatra dero Janārdanaḥ | āhur dhāmra-dhiyo vedam sakarmakum atad-ciduh | āstīrya darbhāih prāg-agraiḥ kārtṣnyena xiti-mandalam | stabdho vṛihad-radhād mānī karma nāvaiṣhī yat param | tat karma Hari-toshaṁ yat sā vidyā tan-matir yayā | "Brahmā himself, the divine Giriśa (Śiva), Manu, Daxa and the other Prajāpatis, Sanaka and other devotees, Marichi, Atri, Angiras, Pulastyā, Pulaha, Kratu, Bhṛigu, Vasishtha—all these assertors of Brahma (as the sole essence), and masters of speech, including myself (Nārada) as the last, though seeing, are yet, to this day, unable, by austerity, by science, by contemplation, to see Parameśvara (the supreme God), who sees all things. Wandering in the vast field of the verbal Divinity (the Veda), which is difficult to traverse, men do*

not recognise the supreme, while they worship him as he is circumscribed by the attributes specified in the hymns (mantras). When the Divine Being regards any man with favour, that man, sunk in the contemplation of soul, abandons all thoughts which are set upon the world and the Veda. Ease, therefore, Varhishmat, through ignorance, to look upon works which merely seem to promote the chief good, as if they truly effected that object, (works) which only touch the ear, but do not touch the reality. The misty-minded men, who, ignorant of the Veda, declare that works are its object, do not know [his?] own world, where the divine Janārdana abides. Thou who, obstinate man that thou art, strewest the whole earth with sacrificial grass, with its ends turned to the east, and art proud of thy numerous immolations, thou knowest not what is the highest work of all. That by which Hari (Vishnu) is pleased, is work; that by which the thoughts are fixed on him, is science."

I copy the comment on a part of this passage, viz., on verses 45 and 46 : *Śabda-brahmaṇi rede urur ristāro yasya arthato 'py pāra-sūnye tasmin rarttanānā mantrāṇāṁ lingair rajra-hasta-trādi-guṇa-yukta-vividha-deratā-'bhidhāna-sāmarthyaiḥ parichchinnam eva Indrādi-rūpam tut-tat-karmāgraheṇa bhajantah param Parameśvaraṁ na evi luh || Tarhy anyaḥ ko nāma | karmāḍy-āgrahaṇī hitrā paramēśvaram eva bhajed ity ata āha 'yadā yam anugṛihñāti' | anugrahi hūtuh | ātmam bhāritāḥ san sa tadā loke loka-ryāvahāre rede cha karma-mārgे parinishthitām matiṁ tyajati | "Men, conversant with the verbal Divinity, the Veda, of which the extent is vast, and which, as regards its meaning also, is shoreless, worshipping Parameśvara [the supreme God] under the form of Indra, etc., and circumscribed by the marks specified in the hymns, i.e., circumscribed by various particular energies denominated deities, who are characterised by such attributes as 'wielder of the thunderbolt,' etc.; worshipping Him, I say, thus, with an addiction to particular rites, men do not know the supreme God. What other [god], then, [is there]? He therefore says, in the words, 'When he*

regards any one with favour,' etc., let a man, abandoning all addiction to works, etc., worship the supreme God alone. The reason for this favour [is supplied in the following words]: 'Sunk in the contemplation of soul, he then relinquishes his regard directed to the business of the world and to the Veda, i.e., to the method of works.'"

NOTE II. on Page 22, Line 14.

Mahidhara on the Vajasaneyi Sanhitā (Weber's ed. p. 1) says, in regard to the division of the Vedas: *Tatrādau Brahma-param-parayā prāptaṁ Vedam̄ Vedaryāso manda-matīn manushyān vichintya tat-kripayā chaturdhā vyasya Rig-yajuh-sāmātharrā-khyānīś chaturo vedān Paila-Vaiśampāyanā-Jaimini-Sumanubhyuh kramād upadileśa te cha sraśishyebhyah | Eram param-parayā sahasra-śākho Vedo jātah |* "Vedavyasa, having regard to men of dull understanding, in kindness to them, divided into four parts the Veda which had been originally handed down by tradition from Brahūnā, and taught the four Vedas, called Rik, Sāman, Yajush, and Atharvan, in order, to Paila, Vaisampāyana, Jaimini, and Sumanu; and they again to their disciples. In this way, by tradition, the Veda of a thousand śākhās was produced."

NOTE III. on Page 65, 4th Line from the bottom.

The following extract from the account of the Pūrva-mīmānsā philosophy, given in the Sarva-darsāna-sangraha of Mādhava Achāryya (Bibliotheca Indica, pp. 127 ff.), contains a fuller summary of the controversy between the Mīmānsakas and the Naiyāyikas respecting the grounds on which the authority of the Veda should be regarded as resting, than is supplied in any of the passages which I have quoted in the body of the work. As I have not studied the works of Śabara, Kumārila, Prabhākara, or the other commentators on the Mīmānsā aphorisms, I am unable to say how far this ingenious and interesting

summary is borrowed from those authors. It is probably taken from them in great part, but the special references made, in the course of the discussion, to Udayana Acharyya, Vāgiśvara, and the author of the Nyāya-bhūshana, and the answers made to their objections, rather favour the supposition that the arguments urged by the author of the summary are in part original.

Syād etat | vedasya katham apaurusheyatram abhidhīyate | tat-pratipādaka-pramāṇabhbhāvāt katham manyethāḥ apaurusheyā vedāḥ | sampradāyāvichchhede saty asmaryyamāṇa-karttṛikatvād ātmavād iti | tad etad mandaṁ viśeṣhaṇāsiddheḥ | paurusheyā-veda-vādibhiḥ pralaye sampradāya-richchhedasya kaxikaraṇāt | kiñcha kim idam asmaryyamāṇa-karttṛikatvām nāma | apratiyamāṇa-karttṛikatvam asmarāṇa-gochara-karttṛikatvām rā | na prathamaḥ kalpaḥ Paramesvarasya karttuḥ pramiter abhyupagamāt | na dvitīyo vikalpāsaḥatrāt | tathā hi | kim ekena asmarāṇam abhipreyate sarnair rā | na ādyah | ‘yo dharma-śilo jitamāna-roshah’ ityādīshu muktakoktishu ryabhūchārāt | na dvitīyah | sarvāsmarāṇasya asarvajñā-durjñānatvāt |

Paurusheyatve pramāṇa-sambharāchcha veda-vākyāni paurusheyāni | vākyatvāt | Kālidāsādi-rakya-vat | veda-vākyāni āpta-pranītāni | pramāṇatve sati vākyatvād Manu-ādi-vākyavād iti |

Nanu | ‘Vedasyādhyayanaṁ sarvaṁ gurv-adhyayana-pūrvakam | vedādhyayana-sāmānyād adhunā ‘dhyayanaṁ yathā’ | ity anumānam prati sādhanam pragalbhate iti chet | tad api na pramāṇa-koṭīm praveshtum iṣṭe | ‘Bhāratādhyayanaṁ sarvaṁ gurv-adhyayana-pūrvakam | Bhāratādhyayanatvena sāmpratā-dhyayanaṁ yathā’ iti ābhāsa-samāna-yoga-xematrāt | nanu tatra Vyāsah karttā iti smaryyate ‘ko hy anyah Pundarīkāxād Mahābhārata-kṛid bhavet’ ity ādāv iti chet | tad asāram | ‘richah sāmāni jaṭhīre | chhandāṁsi jaṭhīre tasmād yajus tasmād ajāyata’ iti purusha-sūkte vedusya sakārtṛikatā-pratipādanāt |

Kiñcha anityah śabdaḥ sāmānyavattre sati asmad-adi-vākyendriya-grāhyatvād ghaṭa-vat | nanv idam anumānam sa evāyam ga-kāra ity pratyabhijñā-pramāṇa-pratihatam iti chet | tad ati

phalgu 'lāna-punarjāta-keśa-dalita-kund'-ādāo ita pratyabhi-jñāyā sāmānya-vishayatrena bādhakatvābhavāt |

*Nanr aśarīrasya Parameśvarasya tālo-ādi-sthānābhāvena var-
ṇochchāraṇāsambhavāt kathām tat-praṇītatraṁ vedasya syād
iti chet | na tad bhadraṁ srabhārato 'śarīrasyāpi tasya bhaktā-
nugrahārthaṁ līlā-vigraha-grahaṇa-sambharāt | tasmād vedasya
apaurushheyatva-vācho yuktīr na yuktā iti chet |*

*Tatra samādhānam abhidhīyate | Kim idam paurushheyatvaṁ
sisādhayishitam | purushād utpannatva-mātram | yathā asmad-
ādibhir ahar ahar uchchāryyamānasya vedasya | pramāṇānta-
reṇa ar�ham upalabhyā tat-prakāśanāya rachitaletraṁ rā | yathā
asmad-ādibhir era nibadhyamānasya prabandhasya | prathame
na ripratipattiḥ | churame kim anumāna-balāt tat-sādhanam
āgama-balād rā | na ādyah | Mālūlī-mādharādī-rākyeshu sacya-
bhichāratrāt | atha pramāṇatve suti iti viśishyate iti chet | tad
api na vipaśchito manasi caisadyam āpadyate | pramāṇāntarā-
gocharārtha-pratipādakām hi rākyām Veda-vākyam | tat pra-
māṇāntara-gocharārtha-pratipādakam iti sādhyamāne 'mama
mātā bandhyā' iti vad ryāghātāpātāt | kiñcha Parameśvarasya
līlā-vigraha-parigrahābhupagame 'py atīndriyārtha-du. śanām
na sañjāghatīti deśa-kāla-srabhāra-riprikṛishṭārtha-grahaṇopā-
yābhāvāt | na cha tachcharur-ādikam era tāḍrik-pratīti-janana-
xamam iti mantaryam | dīrshṭānusārcṇaiva kalpanāyā ūśrayaṇī-
yatrat | tad uktām Gurubhīḥ sarvajña-nirākaranā-vclāyām 'ya-
trāpy atīsayo dīrshṭāḥ sa srārthānatilāngghanāt | dūra-sūxmādī-
dīrshṭau syād na rūpe śrotra-vṛittitā' iti | atu eva na āgama-
balāt tat-sādhanam |*

*'Tena proktam' iti Pāṇīny-anuśāsane jāgraty api kāṭhuka-
kālāpa-taittirīyam ityādi-samākhyā adhyayana-sampradāya-pra-
varttaka-vishayatrena upapadyate | tad-vad utrāpi sampradāya-
pravarttaka-vishayatrenāpy upapadyate | na cha anumāna-
balāt śabdasya anityatva-siddhiḥ | pratyalājijñā-virodhāt | na
cha aśaty apy ekatree sāmānya-nibandhanam tad iti sāmpratam |
sāmānya-nibandhanatram asya balarad-bādhakopanipātād āsthī-
yate krachid ryabhichāra-darśanād rā | tatra krachid ryabhī-*

*chāra-darśane tad-utprexāyām uktuṁ scataḥ-prāmānya-vādibhiḥ |
‘utprexeta hi yo mohād ajñātām apि bādhanam | sa sarva-ryaya-
hāreshu saṁśayātmā rinaśyati’ iti |*

*Nanr idam pratyabhijñānam gatrādi-jāti-cishayaṁ na gādi-
vyakti-vishayaṁ tāsāṁ prati-purusham bhedopalambhād | anya-
thā ‘Somisarmā ’dhīte’ iti ribhāgo na syād iti chet | tad apि
śobhām na bibhartti gādi-ryakti-bhede pramāṇābhārcna gatrādi-
jāti cishaya-kulpanāyām pramāṇābharāt | Yathā gatram ajānata
ekam era bhinna-deśa-parimāṇa-saṁsthāna-ryakty-upadhāna-
vāśād bhinna-deśam ica alpam ira mahad ica dūrgham ira
vāmanam ira prathate tuthā ga-ryaktim ajānata ekā ’pi
ryāñjaka-bheda-tat-tud-dharmānubandhiṁ prati�hāsate | etena
viruddha-dharmādhyāsād bheda-prati�hāsa iti pratyuktam |
tatra kiṁ srābhārīko viruddha-dharmādhyāsāo bheda-sādhakat-
rena abhimataḥ prātītiko eā | prathame asiddhiḥ | aparathā
srābhārīka-bheda-bhavyupagame daśa ga-kārān udachārayat Chai-
tra iti prattipattiḥ syād na tu daśakṛitro ga-kāra iti | dritīye
tu ni srābhārīka-bheda-siddhiḥ na hi paropādhi-bhedenā svā-
bhārikām aikyaṁ rihanyate | mā bhūd nabhaso ’pi kumbhādy-
upādhi-bheda-tat-srābhārīko bheda-tatra evāryita-ryarakāro nāda-
nidānah | tad uktam āchāryyaik | ‘prayojanantu yaj jāles tad
rariṇād era labhyate | ryakti-labhyantu nādebhya iti gatrādi dhīr
eyithā’ iti | tathā cha ‘pratyabhijñā yadā śabde jāgaratti niracu-
grahā | anityatrānumānāni sara sareāṇi bādhate’ | Etena idam
apāstuṁ yad arādi Vāgiśwreṇa Mānamanohare ‘anityah śabdah
indriya-riśesha-guṇatratāt chaxū-rāpa-cad’ iti | śabda-dravyātra-
rādinām pratyuxa-siddhē dhranyuṁśe siddha-sādhana-trāchcha |
aśrāraṇutropādhi-bādhitarāchcha | Udayanas tu āśrayāprat-
yaxutve ’py abhārasya pratyaxutām mahatā prabandhena prati-
pādayan nivrittah kolāhalah utpannah śabdah iti ryarahārācha-
raṇe kāraṇam pratyaxām śabdānityatve pramāṇayati sma | so ’pi
viruddha-dhārīma-saṁsargasya aupādhi-katropapādana-nyāyena
datta-rakta-balīnā ira tālak samāpohi | nityatve sarvadopalabdhya-
anupalabdhī-prasāgo yo Nyāyabhrūshāna-kāroktaḥ so ’pi dhrani-
saṁskṛitasya upalambhābhavyupagamāt pratixiptaḥ | yut tu*

yugapad indriya-sambandhitenea pratiniyata-sañskāraka-sañskāryya-bhāvānumānaṁ tad ātmāny anūkāntikam asati halukale | tataschā vedasya apaurusheyatayā nirasta-samasta-śaṅkā-kalaṅkāṇkuratrena svataḥ siddhaṁ dharme prāmāṇyam iti susthitam |

Syād etat | ‘pramāṇatvāpramāṇatvee srataḥ Sāṅkhyaḥ saimāśritāḥ | Naiyāyikās te parataḥ Saugatāś charamaṁ srataḥ | prathamam parataḥ prāhuḥ prāmāṇyaṁ reda-vādināḥ | pramāṇatvāṁ srataḥ prāhuḥ parataschāpramāṇatām’ | iti vādi-vivāda-darśanāt kathaṁkāraṁ srataḥ siddhaṁ dharma-prāmāṇyam iti siddharatkṛitya śīkriyate | kiñcha kim idaṁ srataḥ prāmāṇyaṁ nāma | kim srata era prāmāṇyaḥ jānma | āhosvit svāśraya-jñāna-janyatram kim uta srāśraya-jñāna-sāmagrī-janyatram utāho jñāna-sāmagrī-janya-jñāna-riśeshāśritatram kiṁra jñāna-sāmagrī-māṭru-janya-jñāna-riśeshāśritatram | tatra ādyah sāvara-dyah | kāryya-kāraṇa-bhāvasya bheda-samānādhikaraṇatrena ekasmīn asambhavat | nāpi dṛitīyah | gunasya sato jñānasaya prāmāṇyam prati samarāyi-kāraṇatayā dravyatcāpātāt | nāpi trītyah prāmāṇyaḥ upādhitre jātire rā jānīyogāt | smṛititrā-nudhikaranasya jñānasaya bādhātyantabhārah prāmāṇyopādhiḥ | na cha tasya utਪtī-sambhavaḥ atyantabhārasya nityatcābhuy-pagamāt | ata era na jāter api janīr yujyate | nāpi chaturthaḥ | jñāna-riśesho hy apramā | riśesha-sāmagryāñcha sāmanyā-sāmagrī anuprariśati | śiṁśapā-sāmagryāṁ ira rīxā-sāmagrī | aparatā tasya ākasmikatram prasajet | tasmāt parastarena śīkri-tāprāmāṇyam rījñāna-sāmagrī-janyāśritam ity atiryāptir āpad-yeta | pañchama-rikalpaṁ rikalpayāmaḥ | kiṁ doshābhāva-sahakṛita-jñāna-sāmagrī-janyatram eva jñāna-sāmagrī-māṭra-janyatram kiṁ doshābhārāsaḥakṛita-jñāna-sāmagrī-janyatram | na ādyah | doshābhāra-sahakṛita-jñāna-sāmagrī-janyatram eva parataḥ prāmāṇyam iti parataḥ prāmāṇya-vādibhir ura-rikaraṇāt | nāpi dṛitīyah | doshābhāra-sahakṛitatrena sāmagryāṁ sahakṛitatree siddhe ananyathā-siddhānraya-ryatireka-siddhata�ā doshābhāvasya kāraṇatayā rujra-lepāyamānateāt | abhārah kāraṇam era na bharati iti chet tadā vaktavyam abhāvasya kāryyatram asti na rā | yadi nāsti tadā pāta-pradīkraṁsānupapattyv

nityatā-prasāngah | atha asti kim aparāddhaṁ kāraṇatreno
 iti sā ubhayataḥ-pāśā rājjuh | tad uditam Udayanena ‘bhāro
 yathā tathā ‘bhārah kāraṇām kāryya-rat mutah’ iti | tathā
 cha prayogah | rimatā pramā jñāna-hetv-atirikta-hetv-adhīnā
 kāryatré sati tad-riseshatrāt apramā-rat | prāmānyam parato
 jñāyate anabhyāsa-dusñāyam sāñśayikatrāt aprāmānya-rat |
 tasmāl utpattau jñāptau cha paratastee pramāna-sambhavāt
 srataḥ siddham prāmānyam ity etat pūti-kushmāṇḍāyate iti
 chet | tad etad ākāśa muṣṭi-hananāyate | rījñāna-sāmagrī-jan-
 yatre sati tad-atirikta-hetr-ajanyatram pramāyāḥ scatastram iti
 nirukti-sumbhācāt | asti cha altra anumānam | rimatā pramā
 rījñāna-sāmagrī-janyatre sati tad-atirikta-junyā na bharati |
 apramātē nadhikarāyatrāt ghatādī rat | na cha aulayanam
 anumānam paratastra-sādhakam iti śūpkānīyam | pramā dosha-
 ryatirikta-jñāna-hetr-atirikta-janyā na bharati | jñānatād apra-
 māvad | iti pratisādhana-graha-grastatrāt | jñāna-sāmagrī-mātrād
 era pramotpatti-sambhāre tad-atirikta-yuṇasya doshābhā-
 rasya vā kāraṇatra-kalpanāyam kalpanā-gaurara-prasāngāch-
 cha | nanu doshasya apramā-hetutena tad-abhārasya pramām
 prati hetutām durnirāram iti chet | na doshābhārasya apramā-
 pratibandhakatrena anyathā [a?] siddhatrāt | ‘tasmāl guṇebhyo
 doshānām abhāras tad-abhāratuh | aprāmānya-deyāsattrām
 tenotsargo nayoditah’ iti | tathā pramā-jñāptir api jñāna-jñā-
 paka-sāmagrīta era jāyate | na cha saṁśayānudaya-prasāngo
 bādhaka iti yuktām raktaṁ | saty api pratibhāsa-pushkala-
 kārane pratibandhaka-doshādī-samudradhānāt tad-upapattih |
 kiñcha tācakam anumānam srataḥ-pramāṇam na vā | ādye
 anaikāntikatā | dvitīye tasyāpi parataḥ prāmānyam evām tasya
 tusyāpi ity anavasthā duravasthā syat | yad altra Kusumāñjalāv
 Udayanena jhaṭiti prachura-pravṛtteḥ prāmānya-niśchayādhlīn-
 atvābhāram āpadayatā prānyagādi pravṛttir hi ichchhām apex-
 ate tat-prāchuryye cha ichchhā-prāchuryyyam ichchhā chesṭha-
 sādhanatā-jñānaṁ tachcha iṣṭa-jātiyatra-lingānubhāraṁ so ’pi
 indriyārtha-sannikarsham prāmānya-grahāṇantu na krachid
 upayāyate iti tad api taskarasya purustāt kaxē surāṇam

*upetya sarvāngodghāṭanum iva pratibhāti | atah samihita-sādh-
ana-jñānam eva pramāṇatayā avagamyamānam ichchhām jana-
yati ity atraira sphuṭa era prāmāṇya-grahaṇasya upayogaḥ |
kiñcha kvachid api ched nirvichikitsā pravrittih saṃsayād upa-
padyeta tarli sarvatra tathā-bhāva-sambhavāt prāmāṇya-niśchayo
nirarthakāḥ syāt anischtasya sattram era durlabham iti prā-
māṇyaṁ datta-jalāñjalikam bhavet ity alam ati-prapañchena |
yasmād uktam ‘tasmād sad-bodhakatrena prāptā buddheḥ prā-
māṇata | arthānyathātra-hetūttha-dosha-jñānād apodhyute’ iti |
tasmād dharme srataḥ-siddha-pramāṇa-bhāve ‘jyotiṣṭomena
svarga-kāmo yajeta’ ityādi-ridhy-arthavāda-mantra-nāmadheyāt-
make rede yajeta ity atra ta-pratyayah prakṛityarthoparaktām
bhāvanām abhidhatte iti siddhe vyutpattim abhyupagachchhatām
abhihitānvaya-rādinām Bhāttāchāryyānām siddhānto yāga-
rishayo niyoga iti kārye vyutpattim anusaratām anīritābhidhāna-
rādinām Prabhākara-gurūnām siddhānta iti sarvam aradātam |*

“ Be it so. But how [the Naiyāyikas may ask] is the Veda alleged to be underived from any personal author? How can you regard the Vedas as being thus underived, when there is no evidence by which this character can be substantiated? The argument urged by you Mīmānsakas is, that while there is an unbroken tradition, still no author of the Veda is remembered, in the same way as [none is remembered] in the case of the soul (or self). But this argument is very weak, because the asserted characteristic [unbrokenness of tradition] is not proved; since those who maintain the personal origin [*i.e.*, origin from a person] of the Veda, object that the tradition [regarding the Veda] was interrupted at the dissolution of the universe (*pralaya*).¹ And further: what is meant by the assertion that no author of the Veda is remembered? Is it (1) that no author is believed? or (2) that no author is the object of recollection? The first alternative cannot be accepted, since it is acknowledged [by us] that God (*Parameśvara*) is proved to be the author. Nor

¹ This objection occurs in a passage of the *Kusumāñjali*, which I shall quote further on.

can the *second* alternative be admitted, as it cannot stand the test of the following dilemma, viz., Is it meant (*a*) that no author of the Veda is recollected by some *one* person, or (*b*) by *any* person *whatever*? The *former* supposition breaks down, since it fails when tried by such stanzas as this, ‘he who is religious, and has overcome pride and anger,’ etc.² And the *latter* supposition is inadmissible, since it would be impossible for any person who was not omniscient to know that no author of the Veda was recollected by *any* person *whatever*.

“ And moreover, [the Naiyāyikas proceed], the sentences of the Veda must have originated with a personal author, as proof exists that they had such an origin, since they have the character of sentences, like those of Kālidasa and other writers. The sentences of the Veda have been composed by an authoritative person, since, while they possess authority, they have, at the same time, the character of sentences, like those of Manu and other sages.

“ But [ask the Mīmānsakas] may it not be assumed that, ‘All study of the Veda was preceded by an earlier study of it by the pupil’s preceptor, since the study of the Veda must always have had one common character, which was the same in former times as now;’³ and that this inference has force to prove [? that the Veda had no author or was eternal]? Such reasoning [the Naiyāyikas answer] is of no avail as proof, [for it might be said in the same way that] ‘All study of the *Mahābhārata* was preceded by an earlier study of it by the pupil’s preceptor, since the study of the *Mahābhārata*, from the mere fact of its being such, [must have] had the same character in former times]

² I do not know from what work this verse is quoted, or what is its sequel. To prove anything in point, it must apparently go on to assert that such a saint as is here described, *remembers the author of the Veda*, or at least has such superhuman faculties as would enable him to discover the author.

³ The purport of this verse is, that as every generation of *students* of the Veda must have been preceded by an earlier generation of *teachers*, and as there is no reason to assume any variation in this process by supposing that there ever had been any student who taught himself; we have thus a *recessus ad infinitum*, and must of necessity conclude that the Vedas had no author, but were eternal.

as it has now ;' and this mere *semblance* of an argument would be of the same value in either case. But [the Mīmānsakas will ask whether there is not a difference between these two cases of the Veda and the Mahābhārata, since] the *smṛiti* declares that [Vishnu incarnate as] Vyāsa was the author of the latter,—according to such texts as this, 'Who else than Pundarīkāxa (*the lotus-eyed Vishnu*) could be the maker of the Mahābhārata ?' (see above, p. 21),—[whilst nothing of this sort is recorded in any Śāstra in regard to the Veda]. This argument, however, is powerless, since it is proved by these words of the Purusha-sūkta, 'From him sprang the *rīk* and *sāma* verses and the metres, and from him the *yajush* verses,' (above, p. 50) that the Veda *had* a maker.

" Further, [proceed the Naiyayikas], we must suppose that sound [on the eternity of which the eternity and uncreatedness of the Veda depend] is not eternal, since, while it belongs to a genus, it can, like a jar, be perceived by the external organs of beings such as ourselves. But [rejoin the Mīmānsakas], is not this inference of yours refuted by the proof arising from the fact that we recognize the letter G, for example, as the same we have heard before ? This argument, [replies the Naiyayika], is extremely weak, for the recognition in question having reference to a community of species (as in the case of such words as 'a jasmine tree with sprouted tendrils [?] cut and grown again,' etc.) has no force to refute my assertion [that letters are not eternal].

" But, [asks the Mīmānsaka], how can the Vedas have been composed by the incorporeal Parameśvara (God), who has no palate or other organs of speech, and therefore cannot enunciate letters ? This objection, [answers the Naiyayika], is worthless, because, though Parameśvara is naturally incorporeal, he can yet, by way of sport, assume a body, in order to shew kindness to his devoted worshippers. Consequently, the arguments in favour of the doctrine that the Veda had no personal author are inconclusive.

"I shall now, [says the Mīmānsaka], clear up all these difficulties. What is meant by this *paurushyatra* ('derivation from a personal author') which it is sought to prove? Is it (1) mere *procession* (*utpannatra*) from a person (*puruṣha*), like the procession of the Veda from persons such as ourselves, when we daily utter it? or (2) is it the *arrangement, with a view to its manifestation,—of knowledge acquired through other channels of information*, in the sense in which persons like ourselves compose a treatise? If the *first* meaning be intended, there will be no dispute. If the *second* sense be meant, I ask whether the Veda is proved [to be authoritative] in virtue (*a*) of its being founded on *inference*, or (*b*) of its being founded on *supernatural information*? The former alternative (*a*) [*i.e.*, that the Veda derives its authority from being founded on inference] cannot be correct, since this theory breaks down, if it be applied to the sentences of the Maṭatī Mādhava or any other secular poem, [which may contain inferences destitute of authority]. If, on the other hand, you say (*b*), that the contents of the Veda are distinguished from those of other books by having authority, this explanation also will fail to satisfy a philosopher. For the word of the Veda is [defined to be] a word which proves things that are not proveable by any other evidence. Now if it could be established that this vedic word did nothing more than prove things that *are* proveable by other evidence, we should be involved in the same sort of contradiction as if a man were to say that *his mother was a barren woman*. And even if we conceded that Parameśvara might in sport assume a body, it would not be conceivable that [in that case] he should perceive things beyond the reach of the senses, from the want of any means of apprehending objects removed from him in place, in time, and in nature. Nor is it to be thought that his eyes and other senses alone would have the power of producing such knowledge, since men can only attain to conceptions corresponding with what they have perceived. This is what has been said by the Guru (Prabhākara) when he refutes [the supposition of] an omniscient

person : ‘ Whenever any object is perceived [by the organ of sight] in its most perfect exercise, such perception can only have reference to the *vision* of something very *distant* or very *minute*, since no organ can go beyond its *own* proper objects, as e.g., the ear can never become cognizant of form.’ Hence the authority of the Veda does not arise in virtue of any supernatural information [acquired by the Deity in a corporeal shape, and embodied in the sacred text].

“ In spite of the weight attaching [?] ⁴ to the rule of Pāṇini (see above, p. 87) that the grammatical affix with which the words Kāthaka, Kalāpa, and Taittiriya are formed, imparts to those derivatives the sense of ‘ uttered by ’ Katha, Kalāpa, etc., it is established that the names first mentioned have reference [not to those parts of the Veda being ‘ uttered ’ by the sages in question, but] to the fact that these sages instituted the practice of *studying* those parts of the Veda. Here also these appellations ought to be understood in the same manner, as referring to the fact of those sages being the institutors of the study of the Veda ; and we are not to think that the eternity of sound [or of the words of the Veda] is disproved by the force of any inference [to be drawn from those names], since this would be at variance with the recognition [of letters as the same we knew before] (see above, Mīmānsa Sūtra, i. 13, p. 56). Nor, even though [numerical] unity were not [predicable of each particular letter] (see Mīmānsa Sūtra, i. 20, above p. 58), is it proper to insist that each letter is a term expressive of a species. The supposition that it is a generic term is opposed [?] by the intervention of powerful contrary arguments ; or by our perceiving that sometimes this character would fail to be applicable. In respect to those who, while they observe that [a definition] is inapplicable in some cases, yet disregard this circumstance, the following remark has been made by those [the Mīmānsakas, etc.] who maintain the self-

⁴ Literally, although the rule of Pāṇini be awake. The sense given in the text is the only one I can think of.

proving power [of the Veda] : 'The man who through bewilderment disregards even an unknown refutation, being in all matters full of doubt, perishes.'

" But [the Naiyāyikas will ask], does not the recognition [of G and other letters as the same we knew before] refer to them as belonging to the [same] *species*, and not as being the [same] *individual* letters, since, in fact, they are perceived to be different [as uttered by] each person, and since otherwise it would be impossible for us to make any distinction [between different readers, as when we say], 'Somaśarman is reading?' This objection, however, has as little brilliancy as its predecessors, and has been answered in this way, viz., that as there is no proof of any distinction of *individuality* between G's, etc., there is no evidence that we ought to suppose any such thing as a *species* of G's, etc. [*i.e.*, of G's and other letters each constituting a species]. Just as to the man who is ignorant that G's constitute a species, [that letter], though one only, becomes (through distinction of place, magnitude, form [?], individuals, and position [?]) variously modified as distinct in place, as small, as great, as long, or as short, in the same way, to the man who is ignorant of an *individuality* of G's, [*i.e.*, of G's being numerically different from each other], this letter, though only one, appears, from the distinction existing between the different persons who utter it, to be connected with their respective peculiarities; and as contrary characters are in this way erroneously ascribed [to the letter G], there is a fallacious appearance of distinctness [between different G's]. But does this ascription of contrary characters which we thus regard as creating a difference [between G's], result from (1) the *nature of the thing*, or (2) from *mere appearance*? There is no proof of the first alternative, as otherwise an inherent difference being admitted between different G's, it would be established that Chaitra had uttered ten [different] G's, and not [the same] G ten times. But on the second supposition, there is no proof of any inherent distinction [between G's]; for inherent oneness (or

identity) is not destroyed by a difference of extrinsic disguises [or characteristics]. We must not conceive, from the merely apparent distinctness [occasioned by the separation of its parts] by jars, etc., that there is any inherent distinctness in the atmosphere itself. The fact is that when the action of sound is intercepted [by the atmosphere], it ceases to be audible.⁵ It has been said by the Āchāryya, 'The object which the Naiyāyikas seek, by supposing a *species*, is in fact gained from the letter itself; and the object at which they aim by supposing an *individuality* in letters, is attained from audible *sounds* (*i.e.*, the separate *utterances* of the different letters), so that the hypothesis of species, etc., is useless.' And we thus reach the conclusion that, 'since, in respect of sounds (letters), recognition has so irresistible a power, [literally, *wakes, unrestrained*], it alone repels all inferences against the eternity [of sound, or the Veda].'

This refutes what has been said by Vāgiśvara in the Mānamanohara, that 'sound is not eternal, because it is the quality of a particular organ, as form is of the eye;' for it is to those who declare sound to be a substance, [and to them only?] that the perception [of sound in this manner] is established, while as regards audible sound, the assertion of this perceptibility is merely a proving of what is admitted; and because this theory of sound being the quality of a particular sense is disproved by the characteristic of not making itself [always?] audible.

⁵ I am by no means sure that this sentence is correctly rendered, but have no preferable translation to suggest. I owe the reader some apology for the imperfect and tentative character of my version in many parts of the remainder of this extract. But having begun the translation, I was naturally anxious to carry it on as far as I could. As this part of the Sarva-darsana-sangraha has not before been rendered into any European language, and we possess as yet no work which explains completely all the technical terms of Indian logic and philosophy, I am unfortunately in an opposite predicament to that on which Kālidāsa congratulated himself at the commencement of his task of celebrating the race of the Raghus, when he was able to say that he could enter upon his subject, which had been previously handled by earlier poets, with the same ease, as a thread penetrates into a gem which has been perforated by a diamond" (*nañau vajra-samukirge sūtrasyevasti me gatiḥ*). The reader must just take this part of my translation for so much as he finds it to be worth. But I think that, though I may have erred in details, I have not mistaken the general scope.

And Udayana—maintaining by a long dissertation that, though the substratum be not perceptible by sense, still the non-existence [of sound] is perceptible, and [observing it to be] a customary occurrence that when noise ceases, sound is produced—alleges that perception, which is the cause of that phenomenon, is a proof of the non-eternity of sound. He also is refuted by showing the merely adventitious character of the [effect produced on letters by the] influence of opposite qualities [in the speakers], just as a sacrificial knife is only stained *superficially* by a bloody oblation. And, again, the difficulty which has been raised to the eternity of sound by the author of the Nyāya-bhūshāna, on the ground that it is not observed to be constantly perceived,—this difficulty also is removed by the admitted fact that sound which has been articulated in utterance is perceived. Once more, the inference which is drawn in reference to there being a fixed relation between the articulator and the [sound] to be articulated, from sound having reference to the organs [of many persons?] at one and the same time, this is inconclusive in itself[?], there being no confused noise. And hence, as every stain of doubt which has come to light has been set aside by the underived character of the Veda, its authority as proof in matters of duty is clearly established.

“ Be it so. But [verse] ‘the Sāṅkhyas say that both authoritativeness and non-authoritativeness are self-derived ; the Naiyāyikas maintain that both are dependent on something external ; the Bauddhas assert that non-authoritativeness is self-derived, while authoritativeness depends on something extraneous to itself ; and the upholders of the Veda declare that authoritativeness is self-derived, and the absence of it dependent on something external.’ Now, when we observe the differences between the assertors of these several views, how can it be admitted as a settled point that there is such a thing as self-proved authority for duty ? And what is this self-proved authority ? What is its source (*lit. birth*) ? Does it spring (1) from self-dependent knowledge ? or (2) from the constituents (or totality) of self-dependent know-

ledge? or (3) does it depend on some special knowledge springing from the constituents (or totality) of knowledge? or (4) does it depend on some special knowledge springing from the *mere* constituents (or totality) of knowledge? The *first* supposition is faulty, from the fact that cause and effect, which are categorically distinct, cannot properly be placed in the same class, or predicated of the same subject. The *second* supposition is no better, owing to the objection that, whereas knowledge is a *quality*, the character of a *substance* is here ascribed to its self-evidencing authority, since the function of a material cause is assigned to it. Nor can the *third* supposition be allowed, for as self-evidencing power is either an *attribute* (*upādhi*) or a *species*, production (*i.e.*, the being produced) does not apply to it. The condition of authoritativeness is the absolute absence of any defect in knowledge which has not recollection [?] for its basis. Now such authoritativeness cannot possibly be *produced*, as it is admitted that absolute non-existence is *eternal*; and consequently the production of *species* also is inadmissible. The *fourth* supposition is equally faulty, for special knowledge is something unauthoritative, and the constituents of the general [or genus] enter into the constituents of the special, as the substance of a tree in general enters into the substance of the [particular] tree, the *sinsapa* (*sisu*). Otherwise we should be involved in the absurdity that it had no cause. Hence that which depends on what is produced from the constituents of knowledge is confessedly unauthoritative, from its dependence on something external, and thus your definition will fail by embracing too much (*ativyāpti*).

"We shall now (interposes the Mīmānsaka) propose a *fifth* supposition. What do you mean by 'springing from the mere constituents, [or simple totality] of knowledge?' Does it mean (1) 'the springing from the constituents of a knowledge which is accompanied by the absence of defects (*i.e.*, which is faultless ?)', or (2) 'the springing from the constituents of a knowledge which is *unaccompanied* by the absence of defects

(*i.e.*, which is faulty)? It cannot be the *first*, for ‘a springing from the constituents of knowledge which is accompanied by the absence of defects [*i.e.*, which is faultless] is simply authoritativeness *derived from something external*, as is allowed by those who maintain that authoritativeness is derived from something external. Nor can it be the *second*, for the character of *accompaniedness* being substantiated in regard to any object, by the circumstance of its being *accompanied* by the absence of defects,⁶

.

If you object that *non-existence* [as in this case of the *non-existence* of defects] cannot be a *cause*, then you must tell us whether it (*non-existence*) is an *effect* or not. If it be not, then from the [consequent] impossibility [of any substance], a piece of cloth [for instance], being destroyed, we are entangled in the absurdity of supposing that it must be eternal. But if non-existence be an *effect*, what error is there in asserting its *causality* also? thus this rope binds [you] at both ends. And Udayana says (*Kusumānjali*, i. 10), ‘Just as existence, so also non-existence is regarded as a cause, as well as an effect.’

And now we shall apply this: variously-understood truth (*pramā*) is (our opponents say) dependent on a cause distinct from the cause of knowledge, from the fact of its being a production, and as such, possessing the particular character of a production, just as is the case with error [or the absence of truth, *aprāmā*]. And authoritativeness is regarded as being derived from something external, owing to the doubtfulness [of the student?] before he has made the matter a subject of repeated study, just as is the case with unauthoritativeness. But to describe as *self-proved* authoritativeness that which, in its origin and in its [earliest] comprehension, thus derives its proof from an *external source*, is (they say) to make an asser-

⁶ I am unable to make out the meaning of the remainder of this sentence, and must therefore leave it untranslated.

tion which is utterly worthless.⁷ But this objection of theirs is as vain as beating the air with their fists. [Such a thing as] a production from the constituents of knowledge [being admitted], it is in not being produced from any cause distinct from *that*, that the self-derivation of truth [or knowledge] consists. This results from the explanation of the term itself. And here we have also an inference [to rely upon]. There being [such a thing as] a production from the constituents of knowledge, variously-understood truth [or knowledge] does not spring from anything distinct from this, since it has not erroneousness as its basis, as jars, etc., [have no unhomogeneous material as their basis (?)]. Nor is it to be surmised that Udayana's inference proves [authoritativeness to have] an external source. Correct knowledge does not, like error, spring from anything distinct from the cause of a knowledge which is devoid of defects, because it is knowledge, so that [Udayana's objection] is carried away by the demon of adverse proof [?]. And since it appears that authoritativeness springs from the simple constituents of knowledge, if you suppose that any quality distinct from *that*, or that the absence of defect, is the cause [of authoritativeness], you will incur the charge of making more suppositions than are necessary to explain the facts. If it be objected to this, that since *defect* is the cause of *unauthoritativeness*, it cannot be denied that the *absence of defect* must be the cause of *authoritativeness*, we deny this, since the absence of defect (or faultlessness) is, on other grounds, not proved⁸ to be that which prevents unauthoritativeness."

I shall not attempt to carry farther my translation of this abstruse discussion, as the remainder contains several parts which I should find it difficult to render. The real proof or disproof of the authority of the Veda must rest on grounds very

⁷ I do not know the proper meaning of the word *pūti-kushmāṇḍīyate*. *Pūti* means either "purification" or "stench;" and *kushmāṇḍīyate* is a nominal verb formed from *kushmāṇḍa*, a "gourd." The compound may therefore mean "it is like a gourd full of filth."

⁸ I take the *anyathāsiddhatrāṭ*, which I find in the Calcutta text, to be for (*anyathā asiddhatrāṭ*).

much less abstract and metaphysical than such as are here argued with so much subtlety.

The following passage from Śankara's commentary on the Brahma Sūtras, iii. 2, 40, is partly quoted in Prof. Banerjea's forthcoming work on Hindu Philosophy. In the two preceding Sūtras, as explained by Śankara, it had been asserted, both on grounds of reason and on the authority of the Veda, that God is the author of rewards. In the 40th Sūtra a different doctrine is ascribed to Jaimini : *Dharmaṁ Jaiminir ata eva || Jaiminis tv āchāryyo dharmam phalasya dātāram manyate | ata eva hetoh śruter upapatteścha | śrūyate tāvad ayam arthaḥ ‘srarga-kāmo yajeta’ ity evam ādīshu rākyesu | tatra cha ridhi-śruter eishaya-bhāropagamād yāgaḥ srargasya utpadakah iti gamyate | anyathā hy ananushthātyiko yāga ḍāpalyeta tatra usya upadeśaeya raiyarthyaṁ syāt | nane anuxaṇa-rināśinah karmanah phalaṁ na upapadyate iti parityakto ‘yam paxah | na esha doshaḥ śruti-prāmānyāt | śrutiś chet pramāṇām yathā ‘yam karma-phala-sambandhah śruteḥ upapadyate tathā kalpayitaryah | na cha anutpādyā kimapy apūrrām karma rināśyat kālāntaritam phalaṁ dātūm śaknoti ity atah karmano vā sūxmaḥ kāchid uttarā-vasthā phalasya vā pūrrāvasthā apūrrām nāma asti iti tarkyate | upapadyate cha ayam arthaḥ uktena prakārcna | Īśvarastu phalaṁ dadāti ity anupapannam urichitrasya kāraṇasya eichitrat-kāryyānupapatteḥ | raishunya-nairghṛinya-prasāngād anushṭāna-raiyarthyāpatteś cha | tasmād dharmād era phalam iti |*

“‘Jaimini says that for this reason virtue [is the giver of reward].’ The Āchāryya Jaimini regards virtue [*i.e.*, the performance of the prescribed rites and duties] as the bestower of reward. ‘For this reason,’ and because it is proved by the Veda. This is the purport of the Vedic text, ‘Let the man who seeks paradise, sacrifice,’ and others of the same kind. As here, we learn the existence of the object [referred to] in the Vedic injunction in question, it is concluded that sacrifice has the effect of producing heaven; for otherwise we should be involved in the absurdity of a sacrifice without a performer [since no one

would care to sacrifice without an object?], and thus the injunction would become fruitless. But may it not be said that it is not conceivable that any fruit should result from a ceremony which perishes every moment, so that this view must be abandoned? No, this defect does not attach to our *Mimānsaka* statement, since the Veda is authoritative. If the Veda be proof, this connection of the reward with the ceremony must be supposed to exist just as it is proved in the Veda. And from the fact that a ceremony which perishes without generating any unseen virtue, can yet produce a reward at a distant time, it must not be concluded that there is either a certain subtle ulterior form of the ceremony, or a certain subtle anterior form of the reward, which is called 'unseen virtue.' And this result is established in the manner before mentioned. But it is not proved that God bestows rewards, because it is inconceivable that a uniform cause should produce various effects, and because the performance of ceremonies would be useless, owing to the inequality and unmercifulness which would attach [to the supposed arbiter of men's deserts]. Hence it is from virtue that reward results."

How far this passage may be sufficient to prove the atheism of the *Mimānsa*, I will not attempt to say. Before we could decide on such a question, the *Sūtras* of that school which refer to this question (if there be any such) would have to be consulted.

Professor Banerjea also quotes the following text from the popular work, the *Vidvan-modatarangini*, in which the *Mimānsakas* are distinctly charged with atheism: *Dero na kaścid bhuvanasya karttā bharttā na harttā 'pi cha kaścid āste | karmānurūpāni śubhāśubhāni prāpynoti sarvo hi junah phalāni || vedasya karttā na cha kaścid āste nityā hi śabdāḥ rachanā hi nityā | prāmānyam asmin svata era siddham anādi-siddheḥ parataḥ katham tat |* "There is no God, maker of the world; nor has it any sustainer or destroyer; for every man obtains a recompense in conformity with his works. Neither is there any maker of the Veda, for its words are

eternal, and their arrangement is eternal. Its authoritative-ness is self-demonstrated, for since this authoritativeness has been established from eternity, how can it be dependent upon anything beyond itself?"

I am informed by Prof. Baurjea that the Mīmānsaka commentator Prabhākara and his school make out the Pūrvamīmānsa to be an atheistic system, while Kumārila treats it as theistic. The last named author makes the following complaint at the commencement of his Vārttika, verse 10 : *Prāyeṇaiva hi mīmānsā loke lokāyatikritā | tām āstika-pathē karttum ayaṁ yatnah kṛito mayā |* "For in practice the Mīmānsa has been for the most part converted into a Lokāyata (atheistic) system (see Colebrooke's Essays, i. 402 ff., or pp. 259 ff. of W. and N.'s ed.); but I have made this effort to bring it into a theistic path." See also the lines which are quoted from the Padma Purana by Vijnāna Bhixu, commentator on the Sāṅkhya aphorisms, in a passage which I shall adduce further on, in a note on p. 103.

NOTE IV. on Page 80, Line 18.

The Tarka-sangraha⁹ says : *Vākyām devividhaṁ vaidikañ lauki-kañcha | vaidikam Īśaroktavāt sarvam eva pramāṇam | lauki-kantu āptoktam pramāṇam anyad apramāṇam |* "Sentences are of two kinds, Vedic and secular. Vedic sentences, from being uttered by Īśvara, are all proof [or authoritative]. Of secular sentences, those only which are uttered by a competent [or wise] person (*āpta*) are proof; the rest are not proof."

In this text, the authority of the Veda is founded on its being uttered by Īśvara; and this characteristic is regarded as limited to the Veda. On the other hand, such secular works as proceed from a competent person (*āpta*) are also declared to possess authority. Here, therefore, a distinction appears to be drawn between the authority of the Veda and that of all other writings,

⁹ See p. 40 of Dr. Ballantyne's ed. with Hindi and English Versions, p. 40 of the Sanskrit.

however authoritative, inasmuch as the former was uttered by Īśvara, while the latter have only been uttered by some competent person (*āpta*). But in the Nyāya aphorism, ii. 68, quoted in p. 80, the authority of the Veda itself is made to rest on the authority of the wise, or competent person (*āpta*), from whom it proceeded. In the aphorism, therefore, either the word *āpta* must mean Īśvara, or we must suppose a difference of view between the author of the aphorism and the writer of the Tarkasangraha. We shall see in the next note that the author of the Kusumānjali coincides with the Tarka-sangraha.

If the author of the Nyāya Sūtras did not believe in an Īśvara (see the conclusion of the next note), he could not of course derive the Veda from such a source. Prof. Banerjea, in his forthcoming work on Hindu Philosophy, quotes the following definition of the word *āpta* from Vātsāyana : *Āptah khalu sāxāt-kṛita-dharmaḥ | yathā-drishṭasya arthaḥ chikhyāpayi-shayā prayuktah upadeshtā | sāxāt-karanam arthaḥ āptis | tayā varttate ity āptah |* “A competent person (*āpta*) means one who has an intuitive perception of duty (the word *sārāt-kṛita-dharman* is used in the Nirukta, i. 20 ; see Part Second, pp. 174 and 176 ; and p. 95, note 48, above),—an instructor possessed by the desire of communicating some subject-matter, just as it was seen by him. This intuitive perception constitutes competence (*āpti*). A person who has this competence is competent.” *Āpta* would thus be equivalent to rishi, and could not refer to Īśvara.

The following words are put by the author of the Vishnu Purana (iii. ch. 18 ; Wilson, p. 340) into the mouth of the deluder who promulgated the Bauddha and other heresies : *Na hy āpta-vādā nabhaso nipatanti mahāsurāḥ | yuktīmad vachanāṁ grāhyam mayā 'nyaiścha bhavadvidhaiḥ |* “Words of the competent do not, great Asuras, fall from the sky. It is only words supported by reasons that should be admitted by me and others like yourselves.”

NOTE V. on Page 81, Line 13.

I extract from the Kusumāñjali of Udayana Āchārya, and its commentary (published at the Sanskrit Press, Calcutta, in the Śaka year, 1769), some fuller statements of the Naiyāyika doctrine regarding the origin and authority of the Veda. Mr. Colebrooke (Ess. i. 263, or p. 166 of W. and N.'s ed.) speaks of this treatise as being accompanied by a commentary of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha; but the one which is printed in the Calcutta edition, is said to be by Haridāsa Bhattachārya. The object of the work appears to be to prove the existence of a personal god (Īśvara), in opposition to various other antagonistic theories.

I. Kusumāñjali, 2nd Stavaka, at the commencement: *Anyathā 'pi paraloka-sādhanānushṭhāna-sambhavād iti dicitya-vipratipattiḥ | Anyathā Īśvaraṁ vinā 'pi paraloka-sādhanām yāgādy-anushṭhānam sambhavati yāgādch sarga-sādhanatrasya veda-gamyatvāt | nitya-nirdoshutayā cha vedasya prāmānyam | mahā-jana-parigrahāchcha prāmānyasya graha iti reda-kāraṇatayā na īśvara-siddhiḥ | yogardhi-sampādita-sārvajñya-kapilādi-pūrraka eva rā redo'stu ity atra āha | “pramāyāḥ paratantratvāt sarga-pralaya-sambhavāt | tad-anyasmīn arīśrāsād na vidhāntura-sambhavāḥ” | Śabdī pramā raktri-yathārtha-vakyārtha-dhīrūpa-guṇa-janyā iti gunādhāratayā īśvara-siddhiḥ | nanu sakartṛike 'stu yathārtha-rākyārtha-dhīr guṇāḥ | akartriike cha rede nirdoshatvam eva prāmānya-prayojakum astu | mahājana-parigrahenā cha prāmānya-graha ity ata āha | “sarga-pralaya-sambhavād” iti pralayottaram pūrva-veda-nāśād uttaru-redasya katham prāmānyam mahājana-parigrahasyāpi tadā abhārāt | śabdasya anityatram utpanno ga-kāra iti pratīti-siddham | prarāhārich-chcheda-rūpa-nityateum api pralaya-sambhavād nāsti iti bhāvāḥ | Kapilādaya eva pūrva[?]sargādau pūrva-sargābhāyasta-yoga-janya-dharmānubhavāt sāxāt-kṛita-sakalārthāḥ karttāraḥ santu | ity ata āha | “tad-anyasmīn” iti | viśra-nārmāṇa-samarthā anīmādi-śakti-sampannā yadi sārvajñās tadā lāghavād eka eva tādrīśāḥ svikriyatām | sa eva bhagavān īśvaraḥ | anityāsarva-*

vishayaka-jñānavati cha visvāsa eva nāsti | iti raidika-ryavahāra-vilopah iti na ridhāntara-sambhavaḥ Īśrānangikartṛi-naye iti śeshah |

"The second objection is that [there is no proof of an Īśvara], since the means of attaining paradise can be practised independently of any such Being. That is to say, the celebration of sacrifices, etc., which are the instruments of obtaining paradise, can take place otherwise, *i.e.*, even without an Īśvara (God). For the fact that sacrifices, etc., are the instruments of obtaining paradise is to be learned from the Veda, while the authority of the Veda rests upon its eternal faultlessness; and the [immemorial] admission of that authority results from its reception by illustrious men. Now, as in this way the Veda is the cause [of final liberation], there is no proof of a God. Or let it be supposed that the Veda was preceded [composed] by Kapila and other sages, who by their wealth in devotion had acquired omniscience.

"In answer to this, the author says: [verse] 'Since truth, [or authoritativeness] depends on an external source (see the passage from the Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha, above, p. 203), since creation and dissolution are probable, and since there is no confidence in any other than God, therefore no other manner can be conceived [in which the Veda originated, except from God (?)].' [Comment] Scriptural truth [or authoritativeness] is derived from the attribute, possessed by its promulgator, of comprehending the true sense of words [*i.e.*, in order to constitute the Veda an authoritative rule of duty, it must have proceeded from an intelligent being who understood the sense of what he uttered, and not, as some maintain (see above, pp. 83, 104, 105), from a being who unconsciously breathed it out]; and since God is the substratum of this attribute [of intelligence], there is proof of his existence.

"But it may be said, that this comprehension of the true sense of what is uttered may be a quality belonging to a created being; and, again, it may be the faultlessness of the uncreated

Veda, which imparts to it its authority, while the [immemorial] admission of that authority results from its reception by illustrious men.

"In answer to this, the author says: 'Since creation and dissolution are probable.' Since the previous Veda (the one which existed during the former mundane period) perished after the dissolution of the universe, how can the subsequent Veda [*i.e.*, the one supposed by our opponents to have existed during the dissolution] be authoritative, since there was not then even any reception of it by illustrious men [who also had all become extinct at the dissolution]. That is to say, the non-eternity of sound is proved by the conviction we have that letters such as G are *produced*, [and not eternal]; and even that eternity (or perpetuity) of the Veda which consists in unbroken continuity of tradition, does not exist, as there is probable proof of a dissolution.¹⁰ But, again, some one will say that Kapila and other saints—who, from their perception of duty, springing from the practice of devotion during the former mundane period, had acquired an intuitive knowledge of every subject—may at the creation have been the authors of the Veda. This is answered in the words, 'since there is no confidence in any other but God.' If persons capable of creating the universe and possessing the faculty of minuteness be omniscient, then, for the sake of simplicity, let one such person only be admitted, namely, the divine Īśvara. And no confidence can be reposed in any person who is not eternal, or who is not possessed of a knowledge which extends to all objects. Thus the Vedic tradition [?] disappears. And so he concludes that no other manner [of the origination of the Veda ?] can be conceived [except from Īśvara?]; that is, in the system of those who deny an Īśvara [no hypothesis

¹⁰ The Mīmānsakas, or at least the Vedantists, seem to reply to this Naiyāyika objection about the interruption of the tradition of the Veda through the dissolution of the universe, by saying that the Veda was retained in the memory of Brahmā during the interval whilst the dissolution lasted. See Kullūka on Manu, i. 23, above, p. 5; and Sankara on the Brahma Sūtras, i. 3, 29, above, pp. 68 and 72; and compare the passages from the Mahābhāshya, etc., in the concluding note of this Appendix.

can be framed which will account for the production of the Veda ?].”

II. Kusumānjali, iii. 16.—*Na pramānam anāptoktir nādriṣṭhe krachid āptatā | adriṣya-driṣṭau sarvajño na chu nityāgamah xamah | ayañ hi sarva-kartritvābhāvāvedakah śabdah anāptoktaś ched na pramānam | āptoktaś ched etad-artha-gochara-jñānarato nitya-sarva-vishayaka-jñānavattvam indriyādy-abhāvāt | āgamas-ya cha nityatvām dūshitarūpa eva prāg iti veda-kāro nityah sarvajñah siddhyati |* [Verse] “The word of an incompetent person is not authoritative ; nor can there be any competency in regard to a thing unseen. To perceive invisible things, a person must be omniscient ; and an eternal scripture is impossible. [Comment] This [supposed] scriptural testimony, denying the fact of any creation whatever, if uttered by an incompetent person, would be no proof. If it was uttered by a competent person, then the person who possessed an acquaintance with this circumstance [universal non-creation] would be master of a knowledge which was eternal, and universal in its range, from his not being limited by any bodily organs. And we have previously disproved the eternity of any scripture (see the first extract from the Kusumānjali, above). Consequently an omniscient and eternal author of the Veda is established.”

III. Kusumānjali, v. 1.—*Kāryyāyojana-dhṛityādeḥ padāt pratyayataḥ śruteḥ | rākyāt saṅkhyā-viśeshāchcha sādhyo visvavid aryah | . . . Pratyayataḥ prāmānyāt | vedā-janya-jñānām kāraṇa-guna-janyum pramātāt | pratyaxādi-pramā-rat | śruter vedāt | vedāḥ paurushcyo vedatrād āyureeda-rat | kiñcha vedāḥ paurushcyo rākyatrād bhāratādi-rat | vedā-rākyāni paurushcyeāni rākyatrād asmad-ādi-rākyā-rat |* [Verse] “An omniscient and indestructible Being is to be proved from [the existence of] effects, from the junction of [atoms], from the support [of the earth in the sky], from action, from belief [in revelation], from the Veda, from sentences, and from particular numbers.”

The following is so much of the comment as refers to the words *pratyaya*, *śruti*, and *rākyā* : “ From belief. i.e., from authorita-

tiveness. The knowledge derived from the Veda is derived from the attributes of its Cause; since it is true knowledge, like the true knowledge derived from perception. From the śruti, i.e., the Veda. The Veda is [shewn to be] derived from a person, by its having the characters of a Veda, like the Ayur-veda. It is also [shewn to be] derived from a person, by having the character of sentences, like the Mahābhārata. The words of the Veda are [shewn to be] derived from a person, by their having the character of sentences, like the sentences of persons such as ourselves."

IV. Kusumānjali, v. 16.—‘*Syām*’ ‘*abhūtam*’ ‘*bhavishyāmī*’ ‘*tyādau saṅkhyā pravaktri-gā* | *samākhyā* ‘*pi cha sākhānām nādyā-pravachanād* ṛite | *Vaidikottama-purushena svatantroch-chārayituh saṅkhyā vāchyā* | ‘*sa aixata eko ‘ham bahu syām’* ityādi *bahulam uttama-purusha śruteḥ* | *saṅkhyā-padārtham anyam āha ‘samākhyā’* ityādi | *sarvāśām sākhānaṁ hi Kāthaka-Kālāpakādyāḥ saṅkhyāḥ sāṅkhyā-riśeshāḥ śrūyante* | *te cha na adhyayana-mātra-nibandhanāḥ* | *adhyctriṇām ānanyat* | *anādāv anyair api tad-adhyayanāt* | *tasmād atīndriyārtha-darsī bhagacān eva Īścarāḥ kāruṇikāḥ sargādāv asmud-ādy-adṛishṭākṛishta* [h?] ¹¹ *kāthakādi-sārīra-riśesham adhishṭhāya yām yām sākhām uktavāṁs tasyāḥ sākhāyās tunnāmnā vyapadeśā iti siddham Īśvara-mananam mora-hetuḥ* | [Verse] “The phrases ‘let me be,’ ‘I was,’ ‘I shall be,’ [which occur in the Veda] have reference to a speaker; and the designations of the *sākhās* could only have been derived from a primeval utterance. [Comment] The first person (I), when it occurs in the Veda, must be employed to denote the words of a self-dependent utterer. Now there are many instances there of such a use of the first person, as in the words, ‘He reflected, I am one, let me become many.’ The author then specifies another signification of the term ‘word,’ or ‘name,’ (*sankhyā*) in the clause, ‘and the designations,’ etc. For all

¹¹ I have translated as if there had been a *visarga* at the end of this word, though there is none in the Calcutta text. If the *visarga* be not allowed, we must translate, “the bodies of *Katha*, etc., which were drawn by the destiny,” etc.

the *sākhās* bear in the Veda the names, the special names, of Kāthaka, Kālāpaka, etc. And these names cannot be connected with the mere study [of these *sākhās* by Katha, Kalāpa, etc.] from the infinite multitude of students, since if the Veda had no beginning, it must have been studied by others besides the persons just mentioned. Wherefore the particular *sākhās* which Īśvara, the seer of objects beyond the reach of the senses, the compassionate Lord himself uttered,—when at the beginning of the creation, drawn on by the destiny (*adrishṭa*) of beings like ourselves, he assumed the bodies of Katha, etc.,—these *sākhās*, I say, were designated by the names of the particular sages [in whose persons they were promulgated]. And so it is proved that the contemplation of Īśvara is the cause of final liberation."

I am unable to say if the ancient doctrine of the Nyāya was theistic, like that of the Kusumānjali, the Tarka-sangraha,¹² and the Siddhānta Muktāvali (p. 6 of Dr. Ballantyne's ed., or p. 12 of his "Christianity contrasted with Hindu Philosophy," and p. 3 of Dr. Röer's Bhāshā-parichchhedā, in Bibl. Ind.) The remarks of Dr. Röer on the subject, in pp. xv., xvi., of the introduction to the last named work, may be consulted. The subject is also discussed by Prof. Banerjea in his forthcoming work on Hindu philosophy. The solution of the question will depend much on the interpretation to be given to the aphorisms of Gotama, 19-21 of the fourth book.

NOTE VI. on Page 89, Line 12.

I find that the phrase *kālātyayāpadishṭa*, which here (and in p. 91, line 21) I have rendered "refuted by the length of time," is a technical term in the Nyāya philosophy, denoting one of the *hetv-ābhāsas*, or "mere semblances of reasons," and is thus

¹² *Jñānādhikaranam ātmā | sa dvividho jīvātmā paramātmā cha | tatra Īśvarāḥ sarvajñāḥ paramātmā eka eva | jīvātmā pratiśarīram bhinno vibhur nityaścha |* "The substratum of knowledge is soul. It is of two kinds, the embodied soul, and the supreme soul. Of these the supreme soul is the omniscient Īśvara, one only. The embodied soul is distinct in each body, all-pervading, and eternal."

defined in the Nyāya Sūtras, i. 49 : *Kalātyayāpadishtah kālā-tūtah* | which Dr. Ballantyne (Aph. of the Nyāya, p. 42) thus explains : "That [semblance of a reason] is Mistimed, which is adduced when the time is not [that when it might have availed]."

"[For example, suppose one argues that] fire does not contain heat, because it is factitious, [his argument is mistimed, if we have already ascertained, by the superior evidence of the senses, that fire does contain heat]."

Part of the comment of Viśvanātha on this sūtra is as follows : *Atita kālasya samānārthahotrāt kālātīta-sabdena uktuṁ kālasya sadhana-kālasya atyaye abhāre apadishtah prayukto hetuh | etena sādhyābhāra-pramā-laxanārtha iti sūchitam | sādhyābhāra-nir-yaye sādhanāsumbhaiścād ayam eva bādhita-sādhyaka iti gīyate |*

NOTE VII. on Page 90, Line 19.

See also the passage from the Vīihad Aranyaka Upanishad (Bibl. Ind. pp. 215, 216), quoted in Part Second, pp. 376, 377, note 4.

NOTE VIII. on Page 103, Line 9.

I find that Vijnana Bhixu, the commentator on the Sankhya aphorisms, takes very nearly the same view as is here quoted from Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, in regard to the superiority of the Brahma Mīmānsa or Vedanta over the other Darsanas.

In his Sankhya-pravachana-bhāshya (Bibliotheca Indica, pp. 3 ff.), he thus writes : *Nyāda ctat | Nyāya-raisekikābhyaṁ atra avirodho bhacatu | brahma-mīmāṁsā-yogābhyaṁ tu cirodho 'sty era | tābhyaṁ nitycṣrara-sādhanāt | atra cha Īścarasya pratishidhyamānatrāt | na cha atrāpi ryārahārika-pāramārthikabhedena seśvara-nirīśvara-vādayor avirodho 'stu seśvara-vādasya upāsanā-paratva-sambhavād iti rāchyam | vinigamakābhāvāt | īśruro hi durjñeya iti nirīśvaratvam api loka-ryavahāra-siddham āīśvaryya-rairāgyāya anuraditāṁ śakyate ātmanah saguṇatvam ira | na tu krāpi śrutyādāv īśvarah sphutum pratishidhyate yena*

ses̄raru-vālasyaica ryārahārikatvam aradhāryetu iti | atra uch-
 yate | atrāpi ryārahārika-pāramārthika-bhāro bhavati | ‘asat-
 yam aprutishthaṁ te jagad āhur anīśuram’ | ityādi-śāstrair
 nīśura-rādasya ninditatrāt | asminn era śāstre ryārahārik-
 asyāra pratishedhasya aīśaryya rairāgyādy-artham anuvādat v-
 auchityāt | yadi hi laukāyatika mutanusāreṇa nityaīśvaryyam
 na pratishidhyeta tadā paripūrṇa-nitya-nārdoshaiśvaryya-darśa-
 nena tatra chittāvīśalo eirckabhyāsa-pratibandhuḥ syād iti sāṅ-
 khyāchāryyānām āśayaḥ | ses̄rara-rādasya na krāpi nindādikam
 asti yena upāsanādi-paratayā tul śāstram saṅhochyeta | yat tu
 ‘nāstī sāṅkhyā sumām jñānaṁ nāsti yoga-samam balam | atra
 rāḥ saṁśayo mā bhūj jñānaṁ sāṅkhyam parum smṛitam’ ityādi
 rākyam tad-eirckāṁśe eva sāṅkhyā-jñānasya darśanāntarebhya
 utkarsham pralipādayati na te iśvara-pratishedāṁśe ‘pi | tathā
 Parāśarādy-akhila-śishtā-saṁcādūlapi ses̄rara-rādasyaира pāra-
 mārthikatram aradhāryate | api cha ‘Arapāda-pranīte cha
 kāṇḍe sāṅkhyā-yogayoh | tyājyah śruti-virudho ’ṁśah śrutyekā-
 śaraṇair nṛibhiḥ | Juiminīye cha Vaiyāse cirudhāṁśo na kaś-
 chanā | śrutyā vedārtha-rījñāne śruti-pāraṁ gatau hi tuu’ | iti
 Parāśaropapurāṇādibhyo ‘pi brahma-mīmāṁsāyā iśvarāṁśe
 balarattram | yathā | ‘nyāya-tantrāny anekāni tais tair uktāni
 rādibhāḥ | hete-āgama-sadāchārair yad yuktām tad upāsyatām’ |
 iti moxa-dharma-rākyād api Parāśarādy-akhila-śishtā-eyacahā-
 reṇa brahma-mīmāṁsā-nyāya-raīśashikādy-ukta iśvara-sādhaka-
 nyāya era grāhyo balarattrāt | tathā | ‘Yām nu paśyanti yogin-
 drāḥ sāṅkhyā api mahesvaram | anādi-nidhanam brahma tam
 era śaraṇam vrāja’ | ityādi-kaurmādi-rākyaiḥ sāṅkhyānām
 iśvarājñānasyaiva nārāyanādinā proktatrāchcha | kiñcha brah-
 ma-mīmāṁsāyā iśrarah era mukhyo rishayah upakramādibhir
 avadhritah | tatrāṁśe tasya bādhe śāstrasyaiva aprāmāṇyam
 syāt | ‘yat-parah śabdaḥ sa śabdārthah’ iti nyāyāt | sāṅkhyā-
 śāstrasya tu purushārtha-tat-sādhana-prakṛiti-purusha-vivekāv
 eva mukhyo vishayah | iti iśvara-pratishedhaṁśa-bādhe ‘pi na
 aprāmāṇyam | ‘Yat-parah śabdaḥ sa śabdārthah’ iti nyāyāt |
 atah sārakāśatayā sāṅkhyam era iśvara-pratishedhaṁśe durhalam

iti | na cha brahma-mīmāṃsāyām api īśvāra eva mukhyo vishayo
 na tu nityaiśvaryam iti raktum ūkylate | ‘smṛity-anacakāśa-
 dosha-prasāṅga’-rūpa-pūrvapaxasya anupapattyā nityaiśvary-
 ya-viśiṣṭatveva eva brahma-mīmāṃsā-vishayatvādharāṇāt |
 brahma-śabdasya para-brahmaṇy eva mukhyatayā tu ‘athātaḥ
 para-brahma-jījñāsā’ iti na sūtritam iti | etena sāṅkhya-virodhād
 brahma-yoga-darśanayoh kāryyeśvara-paratvam api na sāṅkanī-
 yam | prakṛiti-svātantryapattyā ‘rachanānupapattescha na
 anumānam’ ityādi brahma-sūtra-paramparā-nupapattescha |
 tathā ‘sa purveshām api guruḥ kālena anavachchhedād’ iti
 yoga-sūtra-tadīya-ryāsa-bhāskhyābhyaṁ sphuṭam īśa-nityatāraga-
 māchcha iti | tasmād abhyupagama-rādu-praudhi-rādādinā eva
 sāṅkhyasya ryāvahārikesvara-pratishedha-paratayā brahma-
 mīmāṃsā-yogābhyaṁ saha na virodhuḥ abhyupagama-vādaścha
 śāstre dṛiṣṭaḥ | yathā Viṣṇu-purāṇe (i. 17, 54) | ‘Ete bhinna-
 dṛiṣṭām duityā rikulpāḥ kathitā mayā | kṛitrā bhyupagamam
 tatra saṅcepaḥ śrūyatām mama’ | iti | astu rā pāpiṇām jñāna-
 pratibandhārtham āstika-darśanesuḥ apy aṁśataḥ śruti-virud-
 dhārtha-eyavasthāpanām teshu tesho aṁśesho aprāmānyāñcha |
 śruti-smṛity-aviruddheshu tu mukhyo-vishayesu prāmānyam asty
 eva | ata eca Padma-purāṇe brahma-yoga-darśanātiriktānām
 darśanānām nindā ‘py upapadyate | Yathā tatra Pārratiṁ
 prati īśvara-vākyam | ‘śrīm devi pracaryāmī tāmasāni yathā-
 kramam | yeśām śravaṇa-mātrenā pātityam jñāninām api | pra-
 thamaṁ hi mayaivoktaṁ śairam Pāśupatādikam | machchhaḥty-
 āveśitair vīpraiḥ samproktānī tataḥ parum | Kanādena tu sam-
 proktaṁ sāstram rāiśeshikam mahat | Gautamena tathā nyāyam
 sāṅkhyam tu Kapilena rai | dvijanmanā Jaimininā pūrvam veda-
 mayārthataḥ | nirīśvareṇa vādena kṛitam sāstram mahattaram |
 Dhishanena tathā proktam chārvākam ati-garkitam | daityānām
 nāśanārthāya Viṣṇunā Buddha-rūpiṇā | bauddha-sāstram asat
 proktam nagna-nīla-paṭādikam | māyā-vādam asach-chāstram
 prachchhanam bauddham eva cha | mayaiva kathitam devi kalau
 brāhmaṇa-rūpiṇā | apārtham śruti-vākyānām darśayat loka-
 garhitam | karma-svarūpa-tyājyatram atra cha pratipādyate |

*sa*rvā-karma-paribhruṁśād naishkarmyaṁ tatra chochyate | *pa*-rātma-jīvayor aikyam mayā 'tra pratipādyate | brahmaṇo 'syā param rūpaṁ nīrguṇaṁ darśitam mayā | sarvasya jagato 'py asya nāśanārthaṁ kalaū yuge | vedārthavad mahāśāstram māyā-vadām avaidikam | mayairā kathitaṁ deri jagatāṁ nāśa-kāra-nād' | iti | adhikān tu brahma-mīmāṁsā-bhāshye prapañchitam asmābhir iti | tasmād āstika-śāstrasya na kasyāpy aprāmānyam virodho rā sea-sva-cishayeshu sarveshām abādhād avirodhāchcha iti | nanv evam purusha-bahutvāṁśe 'py asya śāstrasya abhyupagama-vādatvāṁ syāt | na syāt | urirodhāt | brahma-mīmāṁsāyām apy 'aṁśo nānā-ryupadesād' ityādi sūtra-jātair jīvātma-bahutvasyaiva nirṇayāt | sāṅkhya-siddha-purushāṇām atmatvāṁ tu brahma-mīmāṁsayā bādhyate eva | 'ātmā iti tāpayanti' iti tatsūtreṇa paramātmāna eva paramārtha-bhūmāv ātmatvāvadhāranāt | tathāpi cha sāṅkhya-sya na aprāmānyam | ryāvahāri-kātmano jīvasya itara-viveka-jñānasya moxa-sādhanatve vivaxi-tārthe bādhābhāvāt | etena śruti-smṛiti-prasiddhayaḥ nānātmai-kātmatrayor ryāvahārika-pāramārthika-bhedena arīrodhāḥ |

" Be it so : let there be here no discrepancy with the Nyāya and Vaiśeshika. But it will be said that the Sāṅkhya is really opposed to the Brahma-mīmāṁsā (the Vedānta) and the Yoga [of Patanjali] ; since both of these systems assert an eternal Īśvara (God), while the Sāṅkhya denies such an Īśvara. And it must not be said (the same persons urge) that here also [as in the former case of the Nyāya and Vaiśeshika], owing to the distinction between practical [or conventional, or regulative] and essential truths, there may be no [real] contrariety between the theistic and the atheistic theories, inasmuch as it appears that the theistic theory has a view to devotion [and may therefore have nothing more than a practical end in view] ;—you are not, it will be said, to assert this, as there is nothing to lead to this conclusion [or, distinction]. For as Īśvara is difficult to be known, the atheistic theory also, which is founded on popular opinion, may, indeed, be maintained for the purpose of inspiring indifference to

the divine majesty, (just as it is [erroneously] asserted that soul has [the three] qualities); but neither the Veda, nor any other śāstra contains a distinct denial of an Īśvara, by which the *merely* practical [or conventional] character of the theistic theory could be shewn. [Consequently the theistic theory is not a mere conventional one, but true, and the contradiction between the atheistic Sāṅkhya and the theistic systems is real and irreconcileable].

To this we reply : in this case also the distinction of practical and essential truths holds. For the *atheistic* theory is censured by such texts as the following : ‘They declare a world without an Īśvara to be false and baseless.’ Now it was proper that in this system (the Sāṅkhya), the merely practical [or conventional] denial [of Īśvara] should be inculcated for the purpose of inspiring indifference to the divine majesty, and so forth. Because the idea of the author of the Sāṅkhya was this, that if the existence of an eternal Īśvara were not denied, in conformity with the doctrine of the Laukāyatikas, men would be prevented by the contemplation of a perfect, eternal, and faultless godhead, and by fixing their hearts upon it, from studying to discriminate [between spirit and matter]. But no censure on the *theistic* theory is to be found in any religious work, whereby [the scope of] that system might be restricted, as having devotion, etc., in view, as its only end. And as regards such texts as the following :—‘There is no knowledge like the Sāṅkhya, no power like the Yoga; doubt not of this, the knowledge of the Sāṅkhya is considered to be the highest,’ they [are to be understood as] proving the superiority of the Sāṅkhya doctrine over other systems, not in respect of its atheism, but only of its discrimination [between different principles]. In the same way it is established by the colloquy of Parāśara, and all other well-instructed persons, that the theistic theory is that which represents the essential truth. Further, such texts as the following of the Parāśara Upapurana, and other works, shew the strength of the Brahma-

mīmāṃsā on the side of its theism, viz., ‘In the systems of Axapūda (Gotama) and Kanāda, and in the Sāṅkhya and Yoga, that part which is opposed to the Veda should be rejected by all persons who regard the Veda as the sole authority. In the systems of Jaimini and Vyāsa (the Vedānta) there is no portion contrary to the Veda, since both these sages, by [adhering to] the Veda [itself], have obtained a perfect comprehension of its true meaning.’ In the same way it results from this text of the Moxa-dharma (a part of the Śānti-parva of the Mahābhārata), viz.: ‘Many systems of reasoning have been promulgated by different authors; [in these] whatever is established on grounds of reason, of scripture, and of approved custom, is to be respected;’ [from this text also, I say, it results] that the theory,—declared in the Brahma-mīmāṃsā, the Nyāya, the Vaiśeṣhika, etc., in consonance with the tradition of Parāśara and all other well-instructed men,—which asserts an Īśvara, is alone to be received, in consequence of its strength; and [it is] also [to be received] because in such passages as this of the Kaurma-purana, viz.,—‘Take refuge with that Maheśvara, that Brahma without beginning or end, whom the most eminent Yogis, and the Sāṅkhyas do not behold,’—Nārāyaṇa (Vishnu) asserts that the Sāṅkhyas are ignorant of Īśvara.

Moreover, Īśvara is determined to be the principal subject of the Brahma-mīmāṃsā by the introductory statement, etc., of that system. If it were open to objection on that side [*i.e.*, on the side of its principal subject], the entire system would be without authority. For it is a rule of logic that ‘the sense of a word is that which it is intended to denote.’ But the principal subjects of the Sāṅkhya are—(1) the grand object of human pursuit, and—(2) the distinction between nature (*prakṛiti*) and spirit (*purusha*), which is the instrument of attaining that grand object. Thus the Sāṅkhya does not lose its authority, even though it be erroneous in so far as it denies an Īśvara. For it is a rule of logic that ‘the sense of a word is that which it is intended to denote.’ Hence, from its being an

essential point, the Sāṅkhya is weak in so far as it denies an Īśvara.

Nor can it be alleged that it is Īśvara only, and not the eternity of his existence, that is the principal subject of the Brahma-mīmāṃsā; since, through the disproof of the objection (*pūrvapāxa*) that the theistic theory 'is chargeable with the defect of rendering the *smṛiti* inapplicable,'¹³ it is ascertained that the assertion of an eternal Īśvara is the main object of the Brahma-mīmāṃsā. But as the word *Brahma* is principally employed to denote the *supreme Brahman*, the first aphorism of the Brahma-mīmāṃsā does not run thus, 'Now follows the enquiry regarding the *supreme Brahman*;' but thus, 'Now follows the enquiry regarding *Brahma*.' Hence we are not to surmise that, from their [otherwise] contradicting the Sāṅkhya, the Brahma-mīmāṃsā and Yoga systems must aim at establishing [not an eternal Deity] but a [secondary] Īśvara, who is merely an *effect*. For this is disproved (1) by the Brāhma Sūtra (ii. 2, 1) which (sounding on the objection that exists to the independent action of *Pradhāna* or nature) concludes that 'an unintelligent cause of the world cannot be inferred, as it is not conceivable that it should have been framed by such a

¹³ I extract here the entire aphorism referred to (Brahma Sūtras, ii. 1, 1), with a few lines of Śankara's commentary. *Smṛity-anavakūṣā-dosha-prasāṅga iti chet | na | anya-smṛity-anavakūṣā-dosha-prasāṅgat | . . . tatra prathamaṁ tāvat smṛiti-virodhām upanyasya pariḥarati | yad uktam Brahma era sarvajñām jayataḥ kūraṇam iti tad ayuktam | kutaḥ | smṛity-anavakūṣā-dosha-prasāṅgat | . . . tasya sanādhibhiḥ | 'na | anya-smṛity-anavakūṣā-dosha-prasāṅgat' iti | yadi smṛity-anavakūṣā-dosha-prasāṅgena īśvara-kūraṇa-vāñdaḥ ūcipyeta evam apy anyā īśvara-kūraṇa-vāñdinyah smṛitayo 'navakūṣā prasājyeran | (Sūtra) "If it be said that [this theory] is [wrong, as it is] chargeable with the defect of rendering the *smṛiti* inapplicable [or contradicting the *smṛiti*], [I answer] No, for [the other theory] would be chargeable with the defect of rendering other texts of the *smṛiti* inapplicable." (Comment) Here, he first of all proposes and removes the objection of contrariety to the *smṛiti*. 'It is wrong,' says the objector, 'to assert that Brahma is the omniscient cause of the world.' Why? 'Because the fault of making the *smṛiti* inapplicable attaches [to this theory]. . . . The difficulty is removed in this way: 'No, for [the other theory] would be chargeable with the defect of rendering other texts of the *smṛiti* inapplicable.' Even if the theory of divine causality were rejected on the ground of rendering the *smṛiti* inapplicable, still [the antagonistic theory] would be open to the objection of rendering inapplicable those other texts of the *smṛiti* which assert a divine causality."*

cause,' and by the series of the following sūtras ; and (2) by the fact that the eternity of God is clearly understood from the Yoga aphorism [i. 26], viz., 'He is also the instructor of the ancients, as he is not circumscribed by time,' as well as from the commentary of Vyāsa thereon.¹⁴ Thus [if we take into account the difference between] the exoteric and esoteric methods of discussion,¹⁵ [we shall find that] as the Sankhya has in view a [merely] practical denial of an Īśvara, it does not contradict the Brahma-mimānsa or the Yoga. The exoteric method [or method of *approach*, to which allusion has been made] is referred to in the Śāstra. Thus it is said in the Vishnu Purana [i. 17, 54, Wilson, p. 132], 'These notions, Daityas, which I have described, are the mistakes of persons who look on the Deity as distinct from themselves. Hear now briefly from me [the views of those who] have made an *approach* [? to the truth].'

"Or let it be [supposed] that even theistic systems, with the view of preventing sinners from attaining knowledge, lay down doctrines which are partially opposed to the Veda ; and that in those particular portions they are not authoritative. Still, in their principal contents, which are consonant to the śruti and the smṛiti, they possess authority. Accordingly, in the Padma Purana we find a censure passed even upon the several philosophical systems (*darśanas*), with the exception of the Brahma (the Vedānta) and the Yoga. For in that work Īśvara (Mahadeva) says to Parvati, 'Listen, goddess, while I declare to you the *tāmasa* works (the works characterised by *tamas*, or the quality of darkness) in order ; works by the mere hearing of

¹⁴ I quote the commentary of Bhoja-rājā on this Sūtra, as given by Dr. Ballantyne (Aphorisms of the Yoga, part first, p. 32) : *Purveshām | udgīnām Brahmadinām api sa guru upadeشتु yataḥ sa kūlenā anarachchhidye anāditivāt | teshām punar īdimatrvād asti kūlenā avachchhedah |* "Of the ancients, that is, of the earliest [beings], Brahmā and the rest, he is the *guru*, i.e., the instructor, because He, as having no beginning, is not circumscribed by time; while they, on the other hand, having had a beginning, *are* circumscribed by time."

¹⁵ I suppose from the context that the expressions *abhyupagama-vīda*, "the mode of discussion which *approaches* the truth," and *prauḍhi-vīda*, "the mode of discussion suited to *advanced* knowledge," answer in some measure to our idea of exoteric and esoteric systems respectively.

which even wise men become fallen. First of all, the Śaiva systems, called Pāśupata, etc., were delivered by myself. Then the following were uttered by Brahmins penetrated by my power, viz. (2), the great Vaiśeshika system of which Kanāda was the author, and (3) the Nyāya and (4) Sāṅkhya, which were promulgated by Gotama and Kapila respectively. Then (5) the great system, the Pūrva-[mīmāṃsā] was composed by the Brahman Jaimini from Vedic materials, but on atheistic principles. So too (6) the abominable Charvāka doctrine was declared by Dhishapa,¹⁵ while Vishnu, in the form of Buddha, with a view to the destruction of the Daityas,¹⁶ promulgated (7) the false system of the Baudhhas, who go about naked, or wear blue garments. I myself, goddess, assuming the form of a Brahman, uttered in the Kali age, the untrue theory of *māyā* [illusion, the more modern form of the Vedānta], which is covert Buddhism, which imputes a perverted and generally censured signification to the words of the Veda, and inculcates the abandonment of ceremonial works, and an inactivity consequent on such cessation. In that system I propound the identity of the supreme and the embodied soul, and show that the highest form of Brahma is that in which he is devoid of the [three] qualities. It was I myself, goddess, by whom this great sāstra, which, composed of Vedic materials and inculcating the theory of illusion, is yet un-Vedic, was declared in the Kali age for the destruction of this entire universe.' We have entered into fuller explanations on this subject in the Brahma-mīmāṃsā-bhāṣya. There is, therefore, no want of authority, nor any contradiction, in any theistic system, for they are all incapable of refutation in their own especial subjects, and are not mutually discrepant. Does, then, this system (the Sāṅkhya) lay down a merely exoteric theory in respect of the multitude of souls also? It does not. For in the Brahma-mīmāṃsā also it is determined by such kinds of texts as the following (Brahma Sūtras, ii.

¹⁵ A name of Vihaspati, according to Wilson's dictionary.

¹⁶ See Wilson's Vishnu Purana, pp. 334 ff.

3, 43), viz., ‘the embodied spirit is a part of the supreme soul, from the variety of appellations,’ that there is a multitude of embodied spirits. But it is denied by the Brahma-mīmānsā that the spirits (*puruṣha*) asserted by the Sankhya have the character of Soul; for it is determined by the Brahma Sūtra (iv. 1, 3), ‘they approach Him as one with themselves,’¹⁷ that on the ground of transcendental truth, the supreme Soul alone has the character of Soul. But, nevertheless, the Sankhya is not unauthoritative; for as the other discriminative knowledge possessed by the embodied spirit in its worldly condition is instrumental to final liberation, this system is not erroneous in the particular subject matter which it aims at propounding. In this way it results from the distinction of practical and real which exists between the two theories (made known by the *śruti* (Veda) and *smṛiti*), of a multitude of souls, and the unity of all soul, that [the Sankhya] is not contrary [to the Vedānta].”

Note IX. on Page 112, Line 22.

Sāyana’s Introduction to R. V. vol i. p. 23.—*Manushya-ṛittānta-pratipādakā rīcho nārāśāṁsyah* | “The *nārāśāṁsi* are verses which set forth the histories of men.”

If these *nārāśāṁsi* were *rīchāḥ*, verses of the hymns, and if, according to Sāyana’s definition, their object was to record events in human history, it follows that these verses must have referred to non-eternal objects. Either therefore Sāyana’s definition must be wrong, or the author of the Mīmānsā Sūras must have made a mistake in asserting that the hymns contain no reference to events which have taken place *in time*.

¹⁷ The original Sūtra runs thus: *Ātmā iti tu upagachchhanti grāhayanti cha* | “They approach Him as one with themselves, and [certain texts] cause them to receive Him as one with themselves.” This refers to certain texts which Sankara adduces from one of the Upanishads, apparently.

NOTE X. on Page 126, Line 15.

The expression here employed, *pitrināñcha manmabhīḥ*, is repeated in R. V. x. 57, 3 (= Vāj. Sanh. 3, 53) : *Mano nu ā huvāmake nārāśāñscena somena pitrināñcha manmabhīḥ* | “We invoke his spirit with soma accompanied by human praises, and by the hymns [or prayers] of the fathers.”

The Vāj. Sanhita reads *stomena*, “hymn,” instead of *somena*. The commentator there explains *nārāśāñscena stotrena* as a “hymn in which men are praised,” and *pitrināñcha manmabhīḥ* as hymns “in which the fathers are revered” (*pitaro yaiḥ stotrair manyante te manmānas tair ityādi*).

NOTE XI. on Page 148, 4th Line from the bottom.

I should have recalled attention here to the verse of the Purusha Sūkta, R. V. x. 90, 9, quoted in p. 10, and also in Part First, pp. 7 and 8, in which the Rik and Sāma verses, the metres, and the Yajush are said to have sprung from the great mystical victim Purusha.

We have also seen that in the passage of the Atharva-veda cited at the top of p. 11, two of the Vedas are said to have sprung from Time. The same Veda, as quoted by Prof. Goldstücker in the Preface to his Manava-kalpa-sūtra, p. 70, assigns yet another origin to the Vedas. Ath. V. xi. 7, 24 : *Richah sāmāni chhandāñsi purāñnam yajushā sahā* | *uchchhishtāj jaññe ityādi* | “The Rik and Sāma verses, the metres, the Purana, with the Yajus, sprang from the remainder of the sacrifice.”

NOTE XII. on Page 149, 3rd Line from the foot.

It appears from Prof. Benfey’s note on S. V. ii. 294 (= R. V. ix. 96, 6, quoted in p. 163), that the scholiast on that passage also makes *devāñam* = *ritvijām*, “priests.”

NOTE XIII. on *Page 176, Line 12.*

In R. V. x. 57, 2, we find the same word *tantu* occurring : *Yo yajñasya prasādhanas tantur deveshu ātatas tam āhutam naśimahi* | “ May we obtain [?] him [Agni?] whom we have invoked, who is the fulfiller of sacrifice, who is the thread stretched to the gods.”

Prof. Roth quotes under the word *tantu* the following text from the Taittiriya Brahmana, ii. 4, 2, 6 : *Ā tantum Agnir divyaṁ tatāna | traṁ nas tantur uta setur Agne trām panthā bhavasi dera-yānah* | “ Agni has stretched the divine thread. Thou, Agni, art our thread and bridge ; thou art the path leading to the gods.”

ADDITIONAL NOTE, on *Page 5, Line 14, and Page 213, Line 1, of the Appendix.*

The following passages from Patanjali's Mahabhāshya, and from the commentaries of Kaiyyaṭa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa, are extracted from fuller quotations given by Prof. Goldstucker in pp. 147, 148, of the very learned Preface to his Mānava-kalpasūtra.

Patanjali.—*Nanu cha uktam ‘na hi chhandāṁsi kriyante nityāni chhandāṁsi’ iti | yadyapy artho nityah | yā tv asau varṇānupūrvī sā anityā tad-bhedāch-chu etad bhavati Kāthakam Kālāpakam Moudakam Paippulādakam ityādi . . . | Kaiyyaṭa.—‘Nityāni’ iti | karttur asmaranāt teshām iti bhāraḥ | ‘yā tv asāv’ iti | mahāpralayādishi varṇānupūrvī-vināśe punar utpadya rishayah saṃskārātisayād redārthaṁ smṛitrā śabda-rachanā ridadhati ity arthaḥ | ‘tad-bhedād’ iti | ānupurvī-bhedād ity arthaḥ | tataścha Kāthādayo vedānupūrvyāḥ karttāraḥ eva ityādi | Nāgojibhaṭṭa.—Āṁśena redasya nityatvām svikṛitya āṁśena anityatvam āha ‘yadyapy arthaḥ’ iti | anena vedatvām*

śabdārthobhaya-vṛitti dhvanitcam | nanu ‘dhātā yathā pūrvam
 akalpayad’ ityādi-śruti-balena ānupūrvī api sā eva iti naryā-
 pūrva-mīmāṃsā-siddhāntāt sā nityā iti ayuktam ata āha ‘mahā-
 pralayādīshv’ iti | ānupūrryās tat-tat-xāna-ghaṭitatvena anit-
 yatvam iti bhāvah iti kechit | tanna | ‘yadyapy artho nityaḥ’
 ityādi-vākyā-śesa-virodhāt | arthasyāpi jyotiṣṭhomāder anityat-
 vāt | pravāhāvichchhedena nityatvām tu ubhayor api tasmād
 manvantara-bhedenā ānupūrvī bhinnā eva ‘prati-nanvanta-
 rañchaishā śrutir anyā vidhīyate’ ity ukter ity anye | pare tu |
 ‘artho nityah’ ity atra kṛitakatva-virodhy-anityatrasya eva cikhandassu
 ukteḥ | evañcha artha-śabdenā utra īśrarah | mukhyatayā tasya
 eva sarva-veda-tātpāryya-vishayatrāt | ‘vedaiścha surrair aham
 eva vedyah’ iti Gītokter ity ākuḥ | varṇānupūrryōḥ anityatre
 mānam āha ‘tal-bhedāchcha’ iti | anityatra-vyāpya-bhedenā
 tat-siddhiḥ | bhedo ’tra nānātrām | īśrare tu na nānātrām |
 bhede mānam vyavahāram āha | ‘Kāṭhaka’ ityādi | arthaikye
 ‘py ānupūrvī-bhedād eva Kāṭhaka-kālāpahāli-ryarahārah iti
 bhāvah | atra ānupūrvī anityā ity ukteḥ padāni tāny eva iti
 dhvanitram tud āha tataschā Kāṭhādayah ityādi |

As Prof. Goldstücker has only given (in p. 146 of his Preface) a translation of the above extract from Patanjali, and has left the passages from Kaiyyata and Nagojibhatta untranslated, I shall give his version of the first, and my own rendering of the two last.

Patanjali.—“ Is it not said, however, that ‘the Vedas are not made, but that they are permanent (*i.e.*, eternal)?’ (Quite so); yet, though their sense is permanent, the order of their letters has not always remained the same; and it is through the difference in this latter respect that we may speak of the versions of the Kāṭhas, Kalāpas, Mudakas, Pippalādakas, and so on.”

Kaiyyata on Patanjali.—“ ‘Eternal;’ by this word he means that they are so, because no maker of them is remembered. By the words, ‘the order of their letters,’ etc., it is meant that, the order of the letters being destroyed in the great dissolutions of

the universe, etc., the rishis, when they are again produced, recollecting, through their eminent science, the sense of the Veda, arrange the order of the words. By the phrase, 'through the difference of this,' is meant the difference of order. Consequently, Katha and the other sages [to whom allusion was made] are the authors of the order of the Veda."

Nagojibhaṭṭa on Patanjali and Kātyayana.—“Admitting in part the eternity of the Veda, he declares in the words, ‘though the sense is eternal,’ etc., that it is also in part *not* eternal. By this clause, *vedicity*, or the essence of the Veda, is [declared to consist in] being sound composed of both its constituents, viz., *words* and their *meanings*. But is not the order eternal, since it is a settled doctrine, both of the new and the elder Mīmānsakas,¹⁸ on the strength of such Vedic texts as this, ‘the creator made them as before,’ etc., that the order also is the very same? No; this is incorrect, and in consequence, he says, ‘in the great dissolutions,’ etc. Some say the meaning of this is, that the order is not eternal, inasmuch as it exists in particular [or successive] moments. But this is wrong, because it is opposed to the rest of the sentence, viz., the words, ‘though their sense is eternal,’ etc., and because the objects signified also, such as the *jyotiṣṭoma* sacrifice, are not eternal. Others say that both the sense and the order of the words are eternal [or permanent], owing to the continuity of the tradition; and that consequently it is in different manvantaras that the order of the words is different, according to the text, ‘in every manvantara this śruti (Veda) is made different.’ Others again think that in the words, ‘the sense is eternal,’ etc., an assertion is made by an objector of a non-eternity opposed to [mere] *production*, since it is only such a [qualified] eternity [or permanence] that is mentioned in the Veda; and that thus the word ‘sense,’ or ‘object’ (*arthak*), here refers to Iśvara, because he is the principal object which is had in view in the whole of the Veda, according to the words of the Bhagavad-gīta (xv. 15),

¹⁸ This means, I suppose, Vedantins and Purva Mīmānsakas.

'It is I whom all the Vedas seek to know.' He next states the proof of the assertion that the order of the letters is not eternal, in the words, 'through the difference of this,' etc. The difference in the order is proved by the difference in the things included under the category of non-eternity. Difference here means variety. But in Īśvara (God), there is no variety. He declares ordinary practice to be the proof of difference, in the words 'Kāthaka,' etc., which mean that, though the sense is the same, we use the distinctions of Kāthaka, Kālapaka, etc., in consequence of the difference of order. Here by saying that the order is not eternal, it is meant that the words are the same, and thus the [full] character [of the Veda], as sound [consisting both of words and their meanings, is preserved?]. And this is what is asserted in the words, 'consequently Katha and the other sages,' etc."

After quoting these passages at greater length than I have given them, Prof. Goldstücker goes on to remark in his note: "I have quoted the full gloss of the three principal commentators, on this important Sūtra [of Panini] and its Vārtikas, because it is of considerable interest in many respects. . . . We see Kaiyyaṭa and Nagojibhaṭṭa writhing under the difficulty of reconciling the eternity of the Veda with the differences of its various versions, which, nevertheless, maintain an equal claim to infallibility. Patanjali makes rather short work of this much vexed question; and unless it be allowed here to render his expression *varṇa* (which means 'letter'), 'word,' it is barely possible even to understand how he can save consistently the eternity or permanence of the 'sense' of the Veda. That the modern Mīmānsists maintain not only the 'eternity of the sense,' but also the 'permanence of the text,' which is tantamount to the exclusive right of one single version, we learn, amongst others, from Nāgojibatta. But as such a doctrine has its obvious dangers, it is not shared in by the old Mīmānsists, nor by Nāgoji, as he tells us himself. He and Kaiyyaṭa inform us therefore that *amongst other* theories, there is one, according

to which the order of the letters (or rather words) in the Vaidik texts got lost in the several Pralayas or destructions of the worlds ; and since each Manwantara had its own revelation, which differed only in the expression, not in the sense of the Vaidik texts, the various versions known to these commentators represent these successive revelations, which were 'remembered,' through their 'excessive accomplishments,' by the Rishis, who in this manner produced, or rather reproduced, the texts current in their time, under the name of the versions of the Kāthas, Kalāpas, and so on. In this way each version had an equal claim to sanctity. There is a very interesting discussion on the same subject by Kumārila, in his Mīmānsā-vṛtti (i. 3, 10)."

I N D E X.

A.

Abhyupagama-vāda, 224
 Accentuation, 18
 Achāryya, 202
 Achvuta, 26
 Aditi, 122, 140, 156
 Ādityas, 70, 130, 140
 Adhoxaja, 28
 Adhvaryu, 3, 35, 37 f.
 Adhvaryava (Yajur) Veda, 110
 Adṛiṣṭa, 83, 216
 Agastya, 143
 Agni, 18, 28, 51, 117, 120, 122, 123, 126, 126-129 passim, 132-140 passim, 144, 145, 147, 149, 152, 164, 170, 173, 174, 176, 180, 227
 Agni a source of inspiration, 156 ff.
 Agnihotra, 55
 Aṅkāra, 102
 Aila (Purūravas), 29
 Air, 3 ff., 43
 Aitareya Br., 4
 Alcinous, 166
 Ancients, 95
 Anga, 35
 Angis, 18
 Angiras, 18, 117, 120, 126, 142, 147, 188
 Angirases, 141
 Anukramanis, 89, 172
 Anushtubh, 7, 176
 Anuvyākhyānas, 105
 Apāntaratamas, 23
 Āpastamba, 44, 91
 Apaurushcyatva, 43
 Apollo, 165 ff.
 Apsaras, 104, 143
 Āpta, 209 f.
 Aranyakas, 1, 15

Argives, 167
 Arjuna, 186
 Arka, 120
 Arthavādas, 70, 95
 Aryaman, 164
 Āsuri, 99
 Āśmaka, 35
 Asridhi, 122
 Astronomy, 19
 Asura, 156
 Asuras, 31, 174
 Āśvalāyana, 91
 Āśvattha, 28
 Āśvins, 117, 124, 129, 132 f., 138, 139, 140
 Atirātra, 7
 Atiyāpti, 204
 Atharvan priest, 37
 Atharvan, sage, 18, 117, 120, 157, 182
 Atharvāṅgirases, 8, 27, 104
 Atharva Pariśishtas, 36 f.
 Atharvanas, 37
 Atharva-veda quoted, 10, 120, 155, 158, 159, 176, 227
 Atri, 117, 119, 173, 188
 Atris, 139, 173
 Andalaki, 60
 Aufreicht, Cat. of Bodl. Sans. MSS., 17, 22, 33
 Aupananyava, 111
 Axapāda (Gotama), 222
 Ayāśa, 136
 Ayātayūma, 33
 Ayur-veda, 80, 215

B.

Babara, 60, 61, 63, 112
 Būdarāyana, 47, 50, 51, 65
 Bahvrichas, 27, 35, 37
 Ballantyne's Aphorisms of the Mīmānsa, 52 ff.

Ballantyne's Aphorisms of the Nyāya, 74 ff., 216 f.
 Aphorisms of the Sāṅkhya, 81
 Aphorisms of the Vedānta, 50, 52
 Aphorisms of the Yoga, 223
 Christianity contrasted with Hindu Philosophy, 72, 112, 216
 Mahābhāshya, 72, 155
 Siddhāntamuktāvali, 216
 Synopsis of Science, 103
 Tarka-saṅgraha, 209
 Banerjea, Rev. Prof. K. M., 185, 207, 208, 209, 210, 216
 Baudhāyana, 93, 203, 210, 225
 Baudhāyana, 91
 Bentley, Śāṅka-veda, 71, 118, 119, 127, 128, 134, 135, 137, 145, 153, 161, 163, 174, 227
 Bhaga, 122
 Bhagavad-gītā, 100, 185, 230
 Bhāgavata-purūna, 7, 24, 27, 99, 100, 107, 188 f.
 Bharadvāja, 18
 Bharadvājas, 118
 Bharatas, 173
 Bhāratī, 151, 152, 155
 Bhārgava, 37
 Bhāshā-parichcheda, 216
 Bhoja-rūja, 224
 Bhūr, 3, 4, 6, 10, 72
 Bhuvah, 3, 4, 6, 10
 Bhrigu, 26, 117, 120, 188
 Bhrigus, 38, 129, 130, 132 f.
 Bird, 156

Blackie, on the Theology of Homer, 169
 Boehlking and Roth, Sanskrit Dictionary, 49, 120, 136, 138, 146, 158, 159, 227
 Brahma, 13, 18, 25, 26, 66, 97, 106, 180, 181, 182, 187, 188, 223
 Brahni, 6, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 31, 144, 162, 182 f., 188, 213
 Brahma - mīmānsā, 217, 220 ff.
 Brahma-nīmānsā-bhāṣya, 225
 Brahman (prayer), 121, 144
 —— (priest), 37 f.
 Brahmanas, 23, 29, 65
 Brahmanas, 1, 2, 39, 43 ff., 104 f., 113
 Brahmanaspati, 130, 145, 149, 158, 160
 Brahmarāta, 32, 34
 Brahmarshis, 26
 Brahma Sūtras, 45, 50, 51, 52, 65, 94 ff., 97, 180, 207, 213, 223, 225
 Brahma-vadis, 102
 Brahma-veda, 37
 Brahma-vidyā, 18
 Brahma - vāstu - purana, 17
 Brahmesa, 27
 Brīhaspati, see Vṛīhaspati
 Bīhati metre, 176
 Buddha, 108, 225

C

Calchas, 168
 Caste, 28, 29
 Chaitia, 200
 Chaitra, 12
 Chāndula, 187
 Charanavyūha, 39
 Charana, 33, 35
 Charakas, 35 f.
 Charakāchāryya, 35 f.
 Charakādhvaryus, 33, 35 f.
 Chārvikas, 12, 45, 225
 Chhandas, 106
 Chhandoga, 17
 Chhandogas, 35, 37 f.
 Chhāndogya Brāhmaṇa, 92
 Chhāndogya Upanishad, 3 ff., 106 f., 182 f., 186 f.

Colebrooke, Miscellaneous Essays, 45, 47, 51, 52, 57, 66, 72, 83, 89, 100, 156, 161, 176, 178, 186, 209, 211
 Commentary, 19
 Commentaries on the Vedas, 2
 —— on the Darśanas, 2
 Commentators, 39

D

Dadhyanç, 117, 120
 Dūtyas, 225
 Dantu, 161
 Darśanas, 2, 103
 Daxa, 122, 188
 Demodocus, 166 f.
 Devas, 119, 149, 160, 227
 Devadattī, 70
 Dhī, 121
 Dhīshmī, 225
 Dhīshmī, 121, 151, 152, 153, 175
 Dhūti, 121
 Dirghasaut, 116
 Dissolution of the Universe, 213
 Dushkrīta, 35
 Dvāpiyana, 24
 Dvāparā age, 20, 21, 22, 26

E

Egyptians, 95
 Ekavīñā, 7
 Elemental origin of the Vedas, 3 ff.
 Euripides, 162

G

Gāñibikā, 161
 Gandharva, 156, 158 f.
 Gandharvas, 27 ff.
 Gāyesī, 161
 Gaurī, 161
 Gaya, 140
 Gāyatī, 7
 Gāyatī, 6, 7, 8, 159, 161, 173, 176
 ——, varieties of, 161
 ——, mother of the Vedas, 9
 Girīsa, 188
 Goda, 66, 69 f.
 Gaurava, 111

Gu, 121
 Goldstucker's Dictionary, 120
 —— Mānava-kalpa-sūtra, 227, 228 ff.
 Gotama, author of Nyāya Sūtras, 73 ff., 216, 222
 Gotama, iishi, 131
 Gotamas, 129, 134, 138, 139
 Grammar, 19, 105
 Grecian bards, 165 ff.
 Grītsamadas, 129, 131
 Grote's History of Greece, 165, 167, 168 f.
 Guṇas, 102
 Guru, 91, 199

II

Hall, Sankhya Prav. Bh., 96, 100
 Haṇsi, 29
 Hantī, 150
 Haṇi, 28, 189
 Haridasa Bhāttāchāryya, 211
 Haṇivansha quoted, 8, 9, 10
 Heilon, 165
 Hellas, 168
 Herodotus, 95, 108
 Herod, 95, 165 ff.
 Hinayāgñibhī, 9, 183
 Homer, 165 ff.
 Hotī, 151
 Hotri, 3
 Hymns, see Mantras

I.

Inferior science, 18
 Ila, 151, 152, 155
 Ilad, 166, 168, 169
 Ilon, 168
 Indrī, 29, 70, 117, 118, 120, 123-131 *passim*, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 147, 148, 152, 156, 163, 170, 173, 174, 180, 181, 189
 ——, sceptical doubts regarding, 151
 ——, source of inspiration, 159 f.
 Isvara, 43, 82, 107, 180, 209 f., 211 ff., 220 ff., 230
 Īśvara (Mahādeva), 224

Ithāsas, 2, 8, 17, 22, 24, 73, 90, 94 ff., 104 f., 106 f., 186 f.

J

Jagatī metre, 7, 173, 176
Jaimini, 22, 24, 27, 66, 87, 112, 116, 190, 207, 221, 225

Jalada, 37

Jumadagni, 153

Jan (to generate), 128, 133

Janaka, 38

Jāṇḍīyā, 35

Jāṇudānī, 189

Jāṇḍgavī, 63, 64

Jāṇivodas, 134, 137, 138, 168

John (St.), his First Epistic, 135

 his Gospel, 135

Jupiter, 165 ff.

Jyotiṣṭhomī, 49, 64, 65

K

Kaiyyata, 228 ff.

Kalanjī, 19

Kalapa, 200, 216

Kalapis, 229

Kalipī, 200

Kalipukī, 62, 216, 230

Kālītyāyapadishī, 216 f.

Kālīchūs, 167

Kāli-yugī, 225

Kalidasa, 50, 51, 88, 91, 197, 202

Kanida, 98, 222, 225

Kanva, 117, 125, 140, 148

Kāṇvas, 148

Kalpa or ceremonial Institutes, 19, 91 i., 103, 105 f.

Kapila, 20, 84, 95, 96 ff., 181, 213, 225

Kāpiñjala, 137

Karmasiddhi, 161

Kārttikeyan, 161

Kasyapa, 183

Katha (sage), 60, 61, 87, 200, 215 f.

Kathas, 229

Katha Upanishad, 19

Kathaka, 59 ff., 87 ff., 200, 216, 230

Kātyāyana, 91

Kaurma-purāna, 222

Kausikī, 145

Kaushitaki Br., 4

Kaushitikins, 39

Kauthuma 59 f., 87 ff.

Kautsa, 108

Kṛi, 116, 147

Khilī, 35

Kikītī, 62, 112

Kīratū, 188

Kri (to make), 128

Krishna Dvāipayānī, 21, 22

Kṛita yuga, 20, 23, 29, 30

Kshattrī, 95

Kulluki on Minu, 5, 11, 12, 15, 92, 213

Kumari, 190, 209, 230

Kusikī, 129, 111 f.

Kusumanjali, 180, 196, 205, 211 f.

Kusurubundi, 60

Kuthumi, 60, 87

Kutsī, 111

L.

Anglois, translation of the Rig-vedī, 119, 176

Iassen, Ind Ant., 21

Iukiyatikī, 221

Linga purāna, 161

Lokītī 209

Tomahirshana, 24

M

Mādhaba author of Nyāya-mala-Vistarī, 87

 , author of the Sarva-darsana-sangraha, 190

 , author of the Vedārtha-prakāśa, on T S, 5, 44, 47 ff., 88

Madhu, 21

Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, 101 ff., 217

Madras, 64

Maghavanī, 118, 119, 134, 144, 148, 160

Mahabharata, 22, 50, 60, 88, 197 f., 215

 quoted, 5, 10, 21, 23, 30, 31, 51, 90, 92, 97, 100, 106

Mahabhishyī, 155

Mahadeva, 5, 161

Mahācūṇi (Karttkeya), 161

Mahat, 102

Mahāvara, 5, 71, 222

Mahidhru on the Vay Sūmī, 189

Maitreya, 20

Mādāti Mādhava, 199

Man, 175 f.

Māndhutri, 126

Mānu (Aṣṭya), 143

Mānamanohra, 202

Māṇavī-kalpī-sutī, 228 ff.

Manishi, 121

Mānumū, 121

Māntras, 1, 26, 43 ff., 80, 121, 187

 , magical power ascribed to, 172 ff.

Manu, 22, 23, 92 ff., 97, 117, 119, 122, 142, 182 f., 188

Mānu's Institutes, 4, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 30, 43, 90, 93

Mānavantarās, 11, 21, 24

Mānichi, 188

Mānus, 70, 123, 125, 127, 131, 139, 144, 147, 149

Māti, 121

Mātsya Purāna, 35

Maudī, 37

Māyi, 102

Mādhātithī, 5

Mādhavī, 116

Mātu, 32, 34

Mitrī, 122, 124, 132, 136, 143, 149, 164, 176, 180

Mimamsī, see Pūrvamīmānsā

Mimamsikī, 56, 73 ff., 93 f., 102, 179 f., 190 ff.

 , their alleged atheism, 207 ff.

Mimamsa-vartika, 209, 230

Moxī-dharma, 222

Mudrīkā, 229

Muller, M., 43, 132

 Ancient Sanskrit Lit., 19, 35, 39, 80, 93, 105, 177, 178

 Oxford Essay, 26

 Jour of Ger. Or Soc., 49, 72, 95

Mundaka Up., 17, 103, 105 f., 181 f.

Munis, 101 f., 116

Muses, 165 ff.

N	Patiñjali, Mahabhashya, 39, 228 ff ____ Yogi, 220 ff	Rationalistic treatises, 13, 103
Nâbhaka, 126	Paulkasa, 187	Râkshas, 38, 120
Nâbhaka, 126	Paurusheya, 8, 50, 82	Ri (to move, scnd forth), 136
Nagelbach's Nachhomel- isch Theologie, 171	Pauushevata, 199	Ribhus, 133, 150
Nagoñbhata, 228 ff	Pavâni, 3	Rîch, 121, 165
Nâhuša, 181	Prâtsch, alphabetical list of initial words of <i>rîchas</i> , 71	Rik-verses, 7
Nâuchasîkhî, 62	Phemius, 167	Rig-veda, quotations from, First Mandala—
Nâiyâyikâ, 179 ff, 190 ff, 203	Phi leius, 166	1, 2, —117
Nisatya (Assvins), 136	Philosophical systems, 100 ff	3, 11, 12, —151
Nuadî, 186 f, 158 f	Pippalidikâ, 229	12, 11, 121
Nuâyna, 22, 28, 29, 222	Pliti, 140	18, 6, 7, —156
Nuâyna-birtha, 211	Polyphemus, 61	20, 1, —129
Nigada, 27	Prabhûkrî, 91, 190, 199	22, 10, —151
Nigama, 91	209	27, 4, —122
Nirkta, 45 f, 90, 91, 105, 109 ff, 126, 142, 143, 150, 154, 175, 210	Pradhana, 98, 102, 223	31, 1, 2, —117
Nitha, 121	Priyapati, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 71, 73, 90, 182, 183	31, 11, —151
Nivid, 121	Prakrti, 98, 102, 222	31, 18, —129
Nodhîs, 131	Pramagandî, 62	37, 4, —148
Nyâya, 101, 112, 220	Priyam Upamîhî, 98	40, 5, —158
____ Sûtras, 73 ff, 84, 210 216	Priyamî bhedi, 101 ff	48, 14, —117
____, ne they theistic ? 210, 216	Pratidîhî, 143	60, 3, —122
Nyâya-blushma, 191, 203	Priyamî vedi, 224	60, 5, —139
Nyâya mîlî vistava, 86 ff, 90 ff, 93 f	Pravahani, 60, 61 63, 112	61, 2, 137
Nyâya sutra-vritti, 73	Priyamedhi, 117	61, 4, —137
O	Prosody, 19	61, 16, 129
Odysscy 166 f, 169 f	Puli tyi, 189	66, 2, —117
Olympian Muses, 165	Pulîthi 158	67, 3 1/2
Omâkâra, 25, 26, 29	Pundrikixa 198	77, 5, —138
Oriacles, 170	Purâna 2, 8, 17 22, 21, 39 10 50 91 ff, 101, 104 f 156 f	78, 5, —138
I	Purâna 27 ff, 104	80 16, 117
Pâdma-purâna, 209, 224	Purâna 10, 13 52 8, 87, 161, 199, 222, 226 227	83, —122
Pailî, 22, 24, 27, 190	Punishî medhi 29	91 11, —138
Pângâna, 39	Purâna suktî (R. V. 90 1, 3) 10, 4 ^o 50 198 227	91 1, —1 7
Pâppalida, 37	Purâna-mâmâstî Sutras quoted, 52 ff, 69 5, 1, 190	92 2, 122
Panchadasa-stoma, 7	Pushan, 123, 161, 180	102 1, —138
Pindits, 103	R	103, 1, 2 4 —122
Pâmini, 39, 87, 200	Raghûs, 202	116 1, —1 6
Parameśvara, 43, 183, 198 f, 196, 198 f	Râghuvansa, 60	117 2, —129
Parasara, 22, 24, 27, 221 f	Râthugamas, 138	118, 3, —117
Parasara Upapurâna, 221	Rajâs, 29, 102	130 6, —131
Parjanya, 149	Râjasyâ sacrifice, 96	130, 10, 122
Pârvati, 224	Ramâmûryas, 102	131, 1, —117
Pâsupata system, 225	Ramâyanî, 60	139, 9, —117
Pâsupatas, 102	Râthintava 173	143, 1, —122
Patanjali, 102		152, 5, —149
		164, 5, 6, —177
		164, 25 —173
		164, 37, —177
		171, 2, —131
		175, 6, —117
		179, 2, —141
		183, 6, —138
		Second Mandala—
		1, 2, —159
		3, 8, —152
		17, 1, —122
		19, 8, —131

Rig-veda continued	Rig-veda continued.	Rig-veda continued
Second Mandala—	Sixth Mandala—	Eighth Mandala—
23, 2,—158	44, 13,—124	16, 7,—147
24, 1,—122	47, 3,—162	20, 19,—125
35, 2,—131	47, 10,—159	23, 14,—125
38, 8,—129	48, 11,—124	25, 24,—126
Third Mandala—	49, 1,—124	27, 11,—140
1, 20,—123	50, 6,—124	36, 7,—119
2, 1,—133	50, 15,—118	39, 6,—126
18, 3,—152	62, 4,—124	40, 12, 126
21, 3,—147	75, 19,—174	41, 2,—126
29, 15,—144	Seventh Mandala—	41, 5, 6,—163
30, 20,—129	7, 6,—132	44, 12,—126
32, 14,—152	15, 4,—133	48, 3,—162
39, 1,—123	18, 1,—119	49, 9,—171
43, 5,—144	19, 11,—174	51, 4,—130
53, 9,—144	22, 9,—133	55, 11,—127
53, 12,—173	26, 1,—133	63, 7, 8,—127
54, 17,—150	29, 4,—118	64, 6,—51, 58, 164
58, 3,—117	31, 11,—134	65, 5, 6, 12,—127
62, 7,—123	33, 3,—174	77, 4,—134
62, 10,—6, 161	33, 7, 14,—142, 143	84, 4, 5,—134
Fourth Mandala—	34, 1,—153	88, 4,—149
3, 16,—138	34, 9,—153	89, 3, 4,—151
5, 3,—156	53, 1,—119	89, 10, 11,—150
5, 6,—157	53, 2,—124	90, 16,—150, 153
6, 1,—157	56, 23,—124	Ninth Mandala—
6, 11,—129	59, 1,—125	9, 8,—127
11, 3,—157	61, 2,—136	25, 5,—163
16, 20,—129	61, 6,—125	33, 5,—153
20, 5,—117	64, 4,—132	42, 2,—127
32, 12,—138	66, 11,—164	62, 1,—71
34, 1,—152	67, 5,—139	73, 2,—135
43, 1, 2,—153	76, 1,—119	76, 4,—163
50, 1,—118	85, 1,—139	87, 3,—145
Fifth Mandala—	87, 4,—144	91, 6,—127
2, 11,—131	88, 4,—141	92, 3,—104
11, 5,—139	90, 3,—153	95, 1,—135
22, 4,—139	91, 1,—119	95, 2,—163
29, 1,—147	93, 1,—125	96, 11,—119
35, 4,—173	91, 1, 2, 134	96, 5, 7,—103
40, 6,—173	96, 3,—153	96, 18,—147
42, 6,—118	97, 3, 5,—159, 160	99, 4,—127
42, 13,—123	97, 9,—130	107, 7,—147
45, 4,—139	Eighth Mandala—	110, 7,—119
53, 8,—123	3, 3,—146	Tenth Mandala—
Sixth Mandala—	5, 18,—139	4, 5,—157
14, 2,—147	6, 24,—125	4, 6,—128
16, 47,—132	6, 10,—146	7, 2,—135
17, 13,—123	6, 11,—125	14, 15,—120
18, 15,—159	6, 33,—132	20, 10,—149
19, 4,—118	6, 41,—117	21, 5,—157
21, 5,—118	6, 43,—125	23, 5, 7,—135
21, 8,—118	8, 8,—140	26, 4,—161
22, 2,—118	12, 10,—125	27, 22,—148
22, 7,—124	12, 14,—156	35, 6,—153
26, 3,—159	12, 31,—136	39, 14,—132, 164
32, 1,—132	13, 7,—160	42, 1,—110
34, 1,—124	13, 26,—136	54, 6,—130
38, 3,—139	15, 7,—174	56, 14,—120

Rig-veda continued
 Tenth Mandala—
 57, 2,—227
 57, 3,—227
 61, 7,—119
 62, 1, 3,—141
 62, 4, 5,—142
 63, 17, 140
 67, 1,—136
 71, 1 6,—164
 71, 3,—73
 72, 1, 2,—145
 79, 1,—145
 80, 7,—133
 88, 18,—177
 89, 3,—128
 90, 1,—43
 90, 9,—10, 50, 198,
 227
 91, 8,—157
 91, 13,—128
 91, 14,—136
 96, 5,—120
 96, 10,—155
 96, 11,—128
 98, 9,—120
 101, 2,—130
 107, 6,—140
 109, 4,—146
 110, 8,—155
 111, 1,—140
 112, 5,—148
 112, 9,—160
 114, 8 9,—174
 115, 5, 148
 116, 9,—137
 125, 3 5,—155
 129, 5,—45, 178
 129, 6,—46, 180
 129, 5-7,—178
 130, 1 7,—175
 139, 5,—158
 151, 2, 5,—146
 167, 1,—146
 176, 2,—156
 177, 1,—156
 190, 1,—146
Rishi, 6, 89 f, 95, 107,
 109 ff
 —— distinguished as
 new and old, 116
 —— speak of themselves
 as authors of hymns,
 128 ff
 —— supernatural cha-
 racter ascribed to, 141 ff
 —— conscious of divine
 inspiration 148 ff, 164 f
 —— their opposite views
 how reconcileable, 171 f.

Rishis, their confessions of
 ignorance, 177 f
 ——, their idea of inspira-
 tion different from that
 of later writers, 179 f
 —— rival the gods, 180 f
Ritu, 18
Röhr, Bibliotheca Indica,
 7, 8, 19, 96, 100, 190,
 181, 187, 216
Rom ihushan, 22
Roth, Illustrations to Ni-
 rukta, see Nirukti
Roth & **I cxi on**, see Bocht
 lingk and Roth
Rudri, 16, 46 f, 161
Rudras, 69, 130

S

Sabari, 190
Sadasaspati, 156
Sagara, sons of, 97, 99
Sakhas of the Veda, 11,
 20, 39, 60, 83, 215
Sam i-thathnu, 7
Sam i-vedi, impurity of its
 sound, 15, 16
Sam-vedi quoted, 71, 132,
 134, 138, 137, 146, 147,
 149, 161, 163, 174
Sam i, 121, 143
Sam a verses, 7, 176
Sam i wood, 28
Samidhenis, 79
Safisa, 121
Sankti, 188
Sankumara, 196 f
Sanhitas of the Veda, 19,
 27, 104, 106
Sankara Acharyya, 45, 52,
 65 ff, 83, 94 ff, 101,
 104 f, 178, 180, 182,
 187, 188, 207, 213, 223
Sankhyas, 98 f, 102, 203
Sankhya, 101, 112, 220 ff
 —— Aphorisms, 81 ff,
 105
Sankhya-kārikā, 86, 162
**Sankhya-pravachana-bhā-
 shya**, 217 ff.
Santanu, 26
Saptadasa-stoma, 7
Sarasati, goddess, 10, 23,
 151, 152, 153, 155, 170,
 180
 ——, mother of the
 Vedas, 10
Sārīraka, 65

**Sārīraka - mīmānsā - bhā-
 shya**, 66
Sarva - darsana - sangraha,
 190 ff
Satapatha Brāhmaṇa
 quoted, 3, 7, 29, 36, 113,
 120
Sattva guna, 11, 102, 185
Saty iv iha, 18
Saty ivatī, 27
Saunaka, 18
Saunikas, 37
Sivitri, 161, 176
Sivitri, 6
Siyana, Vedarthaprikāsa,
 or commentay on R V,
 40 ff, 51, 59, 61, 63,
 106, 117, 120, 121, 122,
 123, 124, 129, 131, 132 f,
 139, 147, 149, 151, 157,
 159, 173, 178, 179, 226
Savat-krita-dharmān, 210
Suddh iत्ति-mukt iवल, 216
Siv i, 35, 161, 188
Siksh i, 58, 105
Sinsapa (सिंपा), tree, 204
Slokas, 8, 104
Smriti, 13, 43, 44 ff, 91,
 93, 95 f, 100, 198, 223
Sobhai, 125
Soma god, 119, 127, 135,
 139, 147, 148, 164, 176,
 180
 ——, source of inspiration,
 162 f
Som i, juice, 152
Somasaiman, 201
Soul, diversity of, 98
Sound, eternity of, 52 ff
Speech, 5, 108, 160
Spho ti, 25, 72, 84 f.
Sraman i, 187
Sṛuti, 1, 11, 13, 100
Stoma, 121
Stuti, 121
Sūdias, 50, 66
Sūkti, 121
Sumani, 121
Sumanu, 22, 24, 27, 190
Sun, 3 ff, 43
Superior science, 18
Sushtuti, 121
Sūrya, 170
Sūta, 22, 24
Sūtras or Aphorisms, 8,
 39, 104
Svādhū, 150, 178
Svāhā, 150
Svar, 3, 4, 6, 10
Svarbhānu, 173 f

Svayambhu, 5, 71, 73, 83,
90
Svāyambhuva manvantara,
22, 23
Śvetāśvatara, sage, 181
— Upanishad,
96, 100, 181
Śyāvāsva, 119

T.

Taittiriyas, 33
Taittiriya Brahmana [?],
173, 227
— Sanhitā, 88
— Sākhā 60, 87,
200
— Upanishad, 98
— Yajur-veda, 35

Tamas, 102, 224

Tūmasa works, 224

Tapas, 146, 181

Tarka-sangraha, 209 ff., 216

Tax (to fabricate), 128, 130

Thamyris, 166

Theogonia, 165 ff.

Thestor, 168

Threefold science, 28

Tiraśčī, 134

Tittiri, 33, 60, 87

Tretā yuga, 20, 27 ff.

Trisarvi, 35

Trishubhi, 7

Tritsus, 174

Trivrit, 7

Tvashṭri, 149

U.

Udayana, 180, 191, 203,
204, 206, 211 ff.

Udgātri, 3

Uktha, 7, 121, 143, 174,
176

Ulysses, 166

Upanishads, 1, 2, 8, 17, 26,
40, 103 ff., 106, 181, 226

Upapuranas, 17

Urvaśi, 27 ff., 104, 143

Uśanas, 145

Ushas, 139

Ushmas, 26

Ushnih metre, 7, 176

Utpannatva, 199

V.

Vāch, 73, 108, 121, 150,
151, 153, 154, 155, 170,
180

Vachas, 121
Vāgiśvara, 191, 202
Vājasaneyins, 36
Vājasaneyi ritual, 35
— Sanhita, or
white Yajur-veda, quoted,
35, 120, 146, 155, 161,
227
Vājins, 33, 35
Vairūpa, 7
Vaisampyana, 22, 24, 27,
32 ff., 35, 190
Vaiseshika, 95, 220, 225
Vaiśnavas, 102
Vaisvānara (Agni), 133
Vaivasvata Manvantara,
21, 22, 27
Vaktratunda (Ganeśa), 161
Vulakhilyas, 145, 160
Vālmiki, 60, 89
Varuna, 124, 132, 136,
139, 143, 144, 149, 170,
176, 180
— source of inspiration, 160, 163 f.
Varūtri, 151
Vashat, 150
Vashatkura, 10
Vasiṣṭha, 142 ff., 153,
174, 179
Vasiṣṭhas, 120, 143
Vāstoshpati, 149
Vasus, 69 f., 130
Vatsa, 140
Vātsūyana, 210
Vāyu, 119, 170
Vāyu Purana, 17, 22, 33,
35
Vāsudeva, 97
Vedāṅgas, 58, 91
Vedānta, 101 ff.
— Sūtras, 65 ff.
Vedantists, 102, 179 f.
Vedārtha-prakāsa on R. V.,
40
— on T. S.,
5, 44, 47 ff., 88 f., 90
Vedas, their elemental
origin, 3 ff.
—, world formed from,
4, 5, 71
— issued from Brahma's
mouth, 6 f.
—, breath of great
Being, 7 f., 83 f., 104 f.,
212
— identified with
speech, mind, and life, 8
— identified with Vish-
nu, 11, 16

Vedas sprung from the
Gūyatṛi, 9
— sprung from Saras-
vatī, 10
— sprung from Puru-
sha, 10
— sprung from time, 11
— sprung from remain-
der of sacrifice, 227
— classed with other
Śāstras by the Upa-
nishes, 8, 105 ff.
—, power, dignity, etc.,
of, 12 ff.
—, division of, 11, 20 ff.
—, original extent of,
21, 22
—, mutual hostility of
the different schools of,
36 ff.
—, arguments in sup-
port of their authority,
39 ff., 52 ff., 73 ff., 86 ff.,
196 ff., 212 ff.
—, eternity of, asserted,
11, 52 ff., 69 ff., 107,
164, 196 ff.
—, eternity of, denied,
73 ff., 81 ff., 211 ff.
— superior to other
Śāstras, 90 ff.
— self-proving power,
107 f.
— seen by the rishis,
107, 109
—, remarks on the ar-
guments in support of,
108 ff.
— really composed by
the rishis, 109 ff., 114
— contrasted with later
Śāstras, 114
—, character and con-
tents, 2, 109 ff., 114 f.
—, distinction of new
and old hymns in, 116 ff.
—, see Rishis
Vedic Sanhitās, 103
Vedhas, 116
Vedavyāsa, see Vyāsa.
Verbal Divinity, 188 f.
Videha, 38
Vidvan - moda - taranginī,
208
Vijñāna Bhikshu, 81, 209,
217 ff.
Vidyā, 104
Vimada, 135, 136, 149
Vimadas, 136
Vipaschit, 116

Vipra, 116	Vṛihaspati, author of a śmṛiti, 92	Wilson, H. H., translation of Rig-veda, 152, 177
Vīraज metre, 7, 176	Vṛittira, 125, 127	Sāṅkhyā
Vīरुपा, 51, 58, 164	Vyāhrritis, 26	kārikā, 25, 162
Vishnu, 11 ff., 20, 24, 35, 99, 160, 163, 189, 198, 225	Vyākhyānas, 105	
Vishnu Purana quoted, or referred to, 4, 6, 11, 16, 20 ff., 31, 100, 210, 224	Vyāsa, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 60, 73, 88, 190, 221, 224	
Visvāmitra, 144 f., 173, 179, 181		Y
Visvanatha Bhattacharyya, 73, 217		Yajñidatta, 70
Visvāvasu, 158		Yajñā-priyahishā, 44
Visvedevas, 70, 176		Yajñavalkya, 32 ff., 38
Vṛihad Āraṇyaka Upani- shad, 7 ff., 38, 71, 103 ff., 108, 150, 180, 187, 217	Weber Ind Lit, 35	Yajñi-veda, see Veda, and Gaithūya and Vājasaneyi Sanhitas
Vṛihaduktha, 130	Ind Stud 4, 36 ff., 100, 101	Yajush, 121
Vṛihit-sama, 7	— Vṛi Sanhitā, 190	Yajush-verses, 7
Vṛihaspati, god, 118, 154, 158, 176	— Vṛi San Spec., 173	Yamī (Agni), 143
, heretical teacher, 225	Wilson, H. H., 2	Yamī, 146
	translation of Vishnu Puranī, 4, 7, 11, 16, 20, 24, 29, 31, 35, 99, 100, 146, 210, 224, 225	Yaska, see Nirukta
		Yātudhīma, 110
		Yoga aphorisms, 224
		— philosophy, 220
		Yogas, 85, 102
		Yogis, 222
		Yugas, 22, 106

